IDSA GUIDELINES

2013 IDSA Clinical Practice Guideline for Vaccination of the Immunocompromised Host

Lorry G. Rubin, Myron J. Levin, Per Liungman, 4 E. Graham Davies, Robin Avery, Marcie Tomblyn, Athos Bousvaros, Shireesha Dhanireddy, Lillian Sung, 10 Harry Keyserling, 11 and Insoo Kang 12

1 Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Steven and Alexandra Cohen Children's Medical Center of New York of the North Shore LIJ Health System, New Hyde Park; ²Section of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, University of Colorado Denver Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora; ³Department of Hematology, Karolinska University Hospital; 4Division of Hematology, Department of Medicine Huddinge, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; 5Department of Immunology, Great Ormond Street Hospital & Institute of Child Health, London, United Kingdom, ⁶Division of Infectious Diseases, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland; ⁷Department of Blood and Marrow-Transplant, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute, University of South Florida, Tampa, ⁸Department of Gastroenterology and Nutrition, Children's Hospital Boston, Massachusetts; ⁹Department of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, University of Washington, Seattle; ¹⁰Division of Hematology Oncology, Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; 11 Division of Pediatric Infectious Diseases, Emory University of School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia 12 Section of Rheumatology, Department of Internal Medicine, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

An international panel of experts prepared an evidenced-based guideline for vaccination of immunocompromised adults and children. These guidelines are intended for use by primary care and subspecialty providers who care for immunocompromised patients. Evidence was often limited. Areas that warrant future investigation are highlighted.

Keywords. vaccination; immunization; immunocompromised patients; immunosuppression; asplenic patients; immunodeficiency patients

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

These guidelines were created to provide primary care and specialty clinicians with evidence based guidelines for active immunization of patients with altered immu nocompetence and their household contacts in order to safely prevent vaccine preventable infections. They do not represent the only approach to vaccination.

Received 4 October 2013; accepted 5 October 2013; electronically published

It is important to realize that guidelines cannot always account for individual var iation among patients. The guidelines are not intended to supplant physician judg ment with respect to particular patients or special clinical situations. The Infectious Diseases Society of America considers adherence to these guidelines to be voluntary, with the ultimate determination regarding their application to be made by the physician in the light of each patient's individual circumstances.

An asterisk (*) indicates recommendation for a course of action that deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Correspondence: Lorry G. Rubin (Irubin4@nshs.edu).

Clinical Infectious Diseases 2014;58(3):e44 100

© The Author 2013. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. All rights reserved. For Permissions, please e mail: journals.permissions@oup.com.

DOI: 10.1093/cid/cit684

4 December 2013.

Recommended immunization schedules for normal adults and children as well as certain adults and chil dren at high risk for vaccine preventable infections are updated and published annually by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and partner or ganizations. Some recommendations have not been ad dressed by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) to the CDC or they deviate from rec ommendations. The goal of presenting these guidelines is to decrease morbidity and mortality from vaccine preventable infections in immunocompromised pa tients. Summarized below are the recommendations made by the panel. Supporting tables that provide addi tional information are available in the electronic version. The panel followed a process used in the devel opment of other Infectious Diseases Society of America guidelines, which included a systematic weighting of the quality of the evidence and the grade of the recom mendation (Table 1). The key clinical questions and recommendations are summarized in this executive summary. A detailed description of the methods,

Table 1. Classification System for Assessing Strength of Recommendations and Quality of the Supporting Evidence

Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence	Clarity of Balance Between Desirable and Undesirable Effects	Methodological Quality of Supporting Evidence (Examples)	Implications
Strong recommendation, high quality evidence	Desirable effects clearly outweigh undesirable effects, or vice versa	Consistent evidence from well performed RCTs or exceptionally strong evidence from unbiased observational studies	Recommendation can apply to most patients in most circumstances. Further research is unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence	Desirable effects clearly outweigh undesirable effects, or vice versa	Evidence from RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodological flaws, indirect, or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from unbiased observational studies	Recommendation can apply to most patients in most circumstances. Further research (if performed) is likely to have an important impact or our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Strong recommendation, low quality evidence	Desirable effects clearly outweigh undesirable effects, or vice versa	Evidence for at least 1 critical outcome from observational studies, RCTs with serious flaws or indirect evidence	Recommendation may change when higher quality evidence becomes available. Further research (if performed) is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Strong recommendation, very low quality evidence (very rarely applicable)	Desirable effects clearly outweigh undesirable effects, or vice versa	Evidence for at least 1 critical outcome from unsystematic clinical observations or very indirect evidence	Recommendation may change when higher quality evidence becomes available; any estimate of effect for at least 1 critical outcome is very uncertain.
Weak recommendation, high quality evidence	Desirable effects closely balanced with undesirable effects	Consistent evidence from well performed RCTs or exceptionally strong evidence from unbiased observational studies	The best action may differ depending on circumstances, patients, or societal values. Further research is unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.
Weak recommendation, moderate quality evidence	Desirable effects closely balanced with undesirable effects	Evidence from RCTs with important limitations (inconsistent results, methodological flaws, indirect, or imprecise) or exceptionally strong evidence from unbiased observational studies	Alternative approaches likely to be better for some patients under some circumstances. Further research (if performed) is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.
Weak recommendation, low quality evidence	Uncertainty in the estimates of desirable effects, harms, and burden; desirable effects, harms, and burden may be closely balanced	Evidence for at least 1 critical outcome from observational studies, RCTs with serious flaws or indirect evidence	Other alternatives may be equally reasonable. Further research is very likely to have an important impact or our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
Weak recommendation, very low quality evidence	Major uncertainty in the estimates of desirable effects, harms, and burden; desirable effects may or may not be balanced with undesirable effects	Evidence for at least 1 critical outcome from unsystematic clinical observations or very indirect evidence	Other alternatives may be equally reasonable. Any estimate of effect, for at least 1 critical outcome, is very uncertain.

Abbreviation: RCT, randomized controlled trial.

background, and evidence summaries that support each recommendation can be found in the full text of the guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR VACCINATION

I. Who Is Responsible for Vaccinating Immunocompromised Patients and Members of Their Household?

- Specialists who care for immunocompromised patients share responsibility with the primary care provider for en suring that appropriate vaccinations are administered to im munocompromised patients (strong, low).*
- Specialists who care for immunocompromised patients share responsibility with the primary care provider for rec ommending appropriate vaccinations for members of im munocompromised patients' household (strong, very low).*

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TIMING OF VACCINATION

II. When Should Vaccines Be Administered to Immunocompetent Patients in Whom Initiation of Immunosuppressive Medications Is Planned?

- 3. Vaccines should be administered prior to planned immu nosuppression if feasible (strong, moderate).
- Live vaccines should be administered ≥4 weeks prior to im munosuppression (strong, low) and should be avoided within 2 weeks of initiation of immunosuppression (strong, low).*
- 5. Inactivated vaccines should be administered ≥ 2 weeks prior to immunosuppression (strong, moderate).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINES FOR HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS OF IMMUNOCOMPROMISED PATIENTS

III. Which Vaccines Can Be Safely Administered to Individuals Who Live in a Household With Immunocompromised Patients? What Precautions Should Immunocompromised Patients Observe After Vaccination of Household Members?

- 6. Immunocompetent individuals who live in a household with immunocompromised patients can safely receive inacti vated vaccines based on the CDC ACIP's annually updated recommended vaccination schedules for children and adults (hereafter, CDC annual schedule; strong, high) or for travel (strong, moderate).
- 7. Individuals who live in a household with immunocom promised patients age ≥6 months should receive influenza vaccine annually (strong, high). They should receive either:
- (a) Inactivated influenza vaccine (IIV; strong, high) or
- (b) Live attenuated influenza vaccine (LAIV) provided they are healthy, not pregnant, and aged 2–49 years (strong, low). Exceptions include individuals who live in a household with an immunocompromised patient who was a hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) recip ient within 2 months after transplant or with graft vs host disease (GVHD) or is a patient with severe com bined immune deficiency (SCID).* In these exceptions, LAIV should not be administered (weak, very low) or, if administered, contact between the immunocompro mised patient and household member should be avoided for 7 days (weak, very low).
- 8. Healthy immunocompetent individuals who live in a household with immunocompromised patients should receive the following live vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule: combined measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccines (strong, moderate); rotavirus vaccine in infants aged 2 7 months (strong, low); varicella vaccine (VAR; strong, moderate); and zoster vaccine (ZOS; strong, moder ate). Also, these individuals can safely receive the following

- vaccines for travel: yellow fever vaccine (strong, moderate) and oral typhoid vaccine (strong, low).
- 9. Oral polio vaccine (OPV) should *not* be administered to individuals who live in a household with immunocompro mised patients (strong, moderate).
- 10. Highly immunocompromised patients should avoid han dling diapers of infants who have been vaccinated with rotavi rus vaccine for 4 weeks after vaccination (strong, very low).
- 11. Immunocompromised patients should avoid contact with persons who develop skin lesions after receipt VAR or ZOS until the lesions clear (strong, low).

VACCINES FOR INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

- IV. Which Vaccines Can Be Administered to Immunocompromised Persons Contemplating International Travel?
- 12. Clinicians may administer inactivated vaccines indicated for travel based on the CDC annual schedule for immuno competent adults and children (strong, low).
- 13. Yellow fever vaccine generally should *not* be administered to immunocompromised persons (strong, moderate). If travel to an endemic area cannot be avoided, vaccination can be considered in the following minimally immunocompromised human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infected individuals:
- (a) asymptomatic HIV infected adults with CD4 T cell lymphocyte count ≥200 cells/mm³ (weak, low)
- (b) asymptomatic HIV infected children aged 9 months 5 years with CD4 T cell lymphocyte percentages of \geq 15 (weak, very low).
- 14. With certain exceptions (eg, yellow fever vaccine and MMR vaccine in certain HIV infected patients [see recommendation 13 and "Recommendations for vaccination of HIV infected adults, adolescents, and children" section] and in certain HSCT patients [see "Recommendations for vaccination of he matopoietic stem cell transplant patients"]), live vaccines should *not* be given to immunocompromised persons (strong, low).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VARICELLA AND ZOSTER VACCINES IN IMMUNOCOMPROMISED PATIENTS

VAR

V. Should Immunocompromised Patients or Those Scheduled to Receive Immune Suppressive Therapy Receive VAR?

15. VAR should be given to immunocompetent patients without evidence of varicella immunity (ie, age appropriate varicella vaccination, serologic evidence of immunity, clinician diagnosed or verified history of varicella or zoster, or laboratory proven varicella or zoster; strong, moderate) if it can be administered ≥4 weeks before initiating immuno suppressive therapy (strong, low).

- 16. A 2 dose schedule of VAR, separated by >4 weeks for patients aged ≥13 years and by ≥3 months for patients aged 1 12 years, is recommended if there is sufficient time prior to initiating immunosuppressive therapy (strong, low).
- 17. VAR should *not* be administered to highly immunocom promised patients. However, certain categories of patients (eg, patients with HIV infection without severe immunosuppres sion or with a primary immune deficiency disorder without defective T cell mediated immunity, such as primary com plement component deficiency disorder or chronic granulo matous disease [CGD]) should receive VAR, adhering to a 2 dose schedule separated by a 3 month interval (strong, mod erate).
- 18. VAR can be considered for patients without evidence of varicella immunity (defined in recommendation 16) who are receiving long term, low level immunosuppression (weak, very low).*
- 19. VAR should be administered to eligible immunocom promised patients as the single antigen product, not VAR combined with MMR vaccine (strong, low).
- VI. Should Immunocompromised Patients or Those Who Will Undergo Immunosuppression Receive Herpes Zoster Vaccine?
- 20. ZOS should be given to patients aged ≥60 years if it can be administered ≥4 weeks before beginning highly immuno suppressive therapy (strong, low).
- 21. ZOS should be considered for varicella positive patients (ie, persons with a history of varicella or zoster infection or who are varicella zoster virus [VZV] seropositive with no previous doses of VAR) aged 50 59 years if it can be admin istered ≥4 weeks before beginning immunosuppressive therapy (weak, low).*
- 22. ZOS should be administered to patients aged ≥60 years who are receiving therapy considered to induce a low level of immunosuppression (strong, low).
- 23. ZOS should *not* be administered to highly immunocom promised patients (strong, very low).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INFLUENZA VACCINE IN THE IMMUNOCOMPROMISED HOST

- VII. Should Immunocompromised Persons Receive Influenza Vaccine?
- 24. Annual vaccination with IIV is recommended for immu nocompromised patients aged ≥6 months (strong, moderate) except for patients who are very unlikely to respond (although unlikely to be harmed by IIV), such as those receiving inten sive chemotherapy* (strong, low) or those who have received anti B cell antibodies within 6 months* (strong, moderate).
- 25. LAIV should *not* be administered to immunocompro mised persons (weak, very low).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH PRIMARY IMMUNODEFICIENCY DISORDERS

- VIII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Primary (Congenital) Complement Deficiencies?
- 26. Patients with primary complement deficiencies should receive all routine vaccines based on the CDC annual sched ule; none are contraindicated (strong, low).
- 27. Patients with primary complement deficiencies and who are
- (a) aged 2 5 years should receive 1 dose of 13 valent pneu mococcal conjugate vaccine (PCV13) if they have re ceived 3 doses of PCV (either 7 valent PCV [PCV7] or PCV13) before age 24 months and 2 doses of PCV13 (8 weeks apart) if they have received an incomplete sched ule of ≤2 doses of PCV7 (PCV7 or PCV13) before age 24 months (strong, low).
- (b) aged 6 18 years with a classic pathway (C1, C2, C3, C4), alternate pathway, or severe mannan binding lectin (MBL) deficiency who have not received PCV13 should receive a single dose of PCV13 (strong, very low).
- (c) aged ≥19 years with a classic pathway (C1, C2, C3, C4), al ternate pathway, or severe MBL deficiency who are PCV13 naive should receive a single dose of PCV13 (strong, very low). For those who received pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine 23 (PPSV23), PCV13 should be administered ≥1 year after the last PPSV23 dose (weak, low)
- 28. Patients aged ≥2 years with an early classic pathway, al ternate pathway, or severe MBL deficiency should receive PPSV23 ≥8 weeks after PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (strong, low).
- 29. Patients with primary complement deficiencies should receive conjugate meningococcal vaccine. A 4 dose series of bivalent meningococcal conjugate vaccine and Haemophilus influenzae type b conjugate vaccine (HibMenCY; MenHi brix, GlaxoSmithKline) should be administered at age 2, 4, 6, and 12 15 months for children aged 6 weeks 18 months (strong, low) or a 2 dose primary series of meningococcal conjugate vaccine, quadrivalent (MCV4) should be adminis tered to patients with primary complement component defi ciency at age 9 months 55 years (MCV4 D [Menactra, Sanofi Pasteur] for those aged 9 23 months; MCV4 D or MCV4 CRM [Menveo, Novartis; CRM, diphtheria CRM₁₉₇ protein] for those aged 2 54 years; strong, low). For persons aged >55 years, MPSV4 (meningococcal polysaccharide vaccine, quadrivalent) should be administered if they have not received MCV4 and MCV4 should be administered if they have received MCV4 (strong, low). For patients aged 9 23 months, the doses should be administered 3 months apart; for patients aged ≥ 2 years, the doses should be admin istered 2 months apart. MCV4 D should be administered ≥4

- weeks after a dose of PCV13 because of a reduced antibody response to some pneumococcal serotypes when MCV4 D and PCV7 are administered simultaneously (strong, low).
- 30. Patients with a primary complement component defi ciency should be revaccinated with MCV4 (or MPSV4 for those aged >55 years who have not received MCV4) every 5 years (strong, low).

IX. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Phagocytic Cell Deficiencies (eg, CGD, Leukocyte Adhe sion Deficiency, Chediak Higashi Syndrome)?

- 31. Patients with phagocytic cell deficiencies should receive all inactivated vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule (strong, low). Children aged 2 5 years should receive PCV13 as in recommendation 27a (weak, very low).
- 32. Patients aged ≥6 years with phagocytic cell deficiencies other than CGD (unless patient with CGD is receiving im munosuppressive medication) should receive PCV13 as in recommendations 27b and 27c (weak, very low).
- 33. Patients aged ≥ 2 years with phagocytic cell deficiencies other than CGD (unless patient with CGD is receiving im munosuppressive medication) should receive PPSV23 ≥8 weeks after receipt of PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (weak, low).
- 34. Live bacterial vaccines, such as bacillus Calmette Guérin (BCG) or oral typhoid vaccine, should not be administered to patients with a phagocytic cell defect (strong, moderate).
- 35. Live viral vaccines should be administered to patients with CGD and to those with congenital or cyclical neutrope nia (weak, low).
- 36. Live viral vaccines should not be administered to pa tients with leukocyte adhesion deficiency, defects of cytotox ic granule release such as Chediak Higashi syndrome, question XIII, recommendations 50 or any other undefined phagocytic cell defect (strong, low).
- X. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Innate Immune Defects that Result in Defects of Cytokine Generation/Response or Cellular Activation (eg, Defects of the Interferon gamma/Interleukin 12 Axis)?
- 37. Patients with innate immune defects that result in defects of cytokine generation/response or cellular activation should receive all inactivated vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule (strong, very low).
- 38. For patients with innate immune defects that result in defects of cytokine generation/response or cellular activa tion, PCV13 should be administered as in recommendations 27a c (weak to strong, very low to low).
- 39. The advice of a specialist should be sought regarding in dividual conditions concerning use of live vaccines in pa tients with innate immune defects that result in defects of

- cytokine generation/response or cellular activation/inflam mation generation (strong, low).
- 40. Live bacterial vaccines should *not* be administered to pa tients with defects of the interferon gamma/interleukin 12 (IFN γ/IL 12) pathways (strong, moderate).
- 41. Live viral vaccines should not be administered to patients with defects of IFN (alpha or gamma) production (strong, low).

XI. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Minor Antibody Deficiencies?

- 42. Patients with immunoglobulin (Ig)A deficiency or spe cific polysaccharide antibody deficiency (SPAD) should receive all routine vaccinations based on the CDC annual schedule, provided that other components of their immune systems are normal (strong, low).
- 43. Children with SPAD or ataxia telangiectasia should receive PCV13 as described in recommendations 27a c (weak to strong, very low to low). Those aged ≥2 years should receive PPSV23 ≥8 weeks after indicated doses of PCV13, and a second dose should be given 5 years later (strong, low).
- 44. Monitoring of vaccine responses can be useful for assessing the degree of immunodeficiency of patients with minor anti body deficiencies and level of protection (weak, moderate).
- 45. OPV should not be administered to IgA deficient pa tients (strong, low).

XII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Major Antibody Deficiencies Who are Receiving Immu noglobulin Therapy?

- 46. Inactivated vaccines other than IIV are not routinely ad ministered to patients with major antibody deficiencies during immunoglobulin therapy (strong, low).
- (a) For patients with suspected major antibody deficien cies, all inactivated vaccines can be administered as part of immune response assessment prior to immunoglob ulin therapy (strong, low).
- 47. IIV can be administered to patients with major antibody de ficiencies and some residual antibody production (weak, low).
- 48. Live OPV should not be administered to patients with major antibody deficiencies (strong, moderate).
- 49. Live vaccines (other than OPV) should not be adminis tered to patients with major antibody deficiencies (weak, low).*

XIII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Combined Immunodeficiencies?

50. For patients with suspected combined immunodeficien cies, all inactivated vaccines can be administered as part immune response assessment prior to commencement of immunoglobulin therapy (strong, low).

- For patients with combined immunodeficiencies who are receiving immunoglobulin therapy, inactivated vaccines should *not* be routinely administered (strong, low).
- 51. For patients with combined immunodeficiencies and re sidual antibody production potential, IIV can be adminis tered (weak, very low).
- Children with partial DiGeorge syndrome (pDGS) should undergo immune system assessment with evaluation of lymphocyte subsets and mitogen responsiveness in order to determine whether they should be given live viral vac cines. Those with $\geq 500 \text{ CD3} \text{ T cells/mm}^3$, $\geq 200 \text{ CD8} \text{ T}$ cells/mm³, and normal mitogen response should receive MMR vaccine and VAR (weak, low).*
- 53. Patients with SCID, DGS with a CD3 T cell lymphocyte count <500 cells/mm³, other combined immunodeficiencies with similar CD3 T cell lymphocyte counts, Wiskott Aldrich syndrome, or X linked lymphoproliferative disease and familial disorders that predispose them to hemophagocytic lymphohis tiocytosis should avoid all live vaccines (strong, moderate).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF HIV-INFECTED ADULTS, ADOLESCENTS, AND CHILDREN

XIV. Which Inactivated Vaccines Should Be Administered to HIV Infected Patients?

- 54. HIV infected patients should be vaccinated according to the CDC annual schedule for the following inactivated vac cines: IIV (strong, high); PCV13 in patients aged <2 years (strong, moderate); H. influenzae type b conjugate (Hib) vaccine (strong, high); diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis (DTaP) vaccine (strong, moderate); tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acel lular pertussis (Tdap) vaccine (strong, very low); tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid (Td) vaccine (strong, low); hepatitis B (HepB) vaccine (strong, moderate); hepatitis A (HepA) vaccine (strong, moderate); inactivated poliovirus (IPV) vaccine (strong, moderate); and quadrivalent human papillomavirus (HPV4) vaccine* in females and males aged 11 26 years (strong, very low) with additions noted below.
- 55. PCV13 should be administered to HIV infected patients aged ≥ 2 years as in recommendations 27a c (strong, low to moderate).
- 56. PPSV23 should be administered to HIV infected chil dren aged ≥2 years of age who have received indicated doses of PCV (strong, moderate), HIV infected adults with CD4 T lymphocyte counts of ≥ 200 cells/mm³ (strong, moderate), and HIV infected adults with CD4 T lymphocyte counts of <200 cells/mm³ (weak, low). PPSV23 should be given ≥8 weeks after indicated dose(s) of PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (strong, low).

- 57. HIV infected children who are aged >59 months and have not received Hib vaccine should receive 1 dose of Hib vaccine (strong, low). Hib vaccine is not recommended for HIV infected adults (weak, low).
- 58. HIV infected children aged 11 18 years should receive a 2 dose primary series of MCV4 2 months apart (strong, moderate). A single booster dose (third dose) should be given at age 16 years if the primary series was given at age 11 or 12 years and at age 16 18 years if the primary series was given at age 13 15 years (strong, low). If MCV4 is adminis tered to HIV infected children aged 2 10 years because of risk factors for meningococcal disease, a 2 dose primary series of MCV4 should be administered with a 2 month in terval between doses, and a booster dose should be given 5 years later (strong, very low).
- 59. HIV infected patients should receive the HepB vaccine series (strong, moderate), with consideration of high dose HepB vaccine (40 µg/dose) for adults (weak, moderate) and adolescents* (weak, low). One to 2 months after completion, patients should be tested for anti HBs (antibodies to HepB surface antigen; strong, low). If a postvaccination anti HB concentration of ≥10 mIU/mL is not attained, a second 3 dose series of HepB vaccine (strong, low; alternative: 1 dose of HepB vaccine after which anti HBs is tested*), using standard dose (strong, moderate) or high dose (40 µg*; weak, low) for children and high dose for adolescents* and adults (strong, low), should be administered.
- 60. HepB vaccine containing 20 µg of HepB surface antigen (HBsAg) combined with HepA vaccine (HepA HepB; Twinrix), 3 dose series, can be used for primary vaccination of HIV infected patients aged ≥12 years (strong, moderate).*
- 61. Internationally adopted HIV infected children who have received doses of OPV should receive a total of 4 doses of a combination of OPV and IPV vaccine (strong, low).
- 62. HPV4 vaccine is recommended over bivalent human papillomavirus (HPV2) vaccine because HPV4 vaccine pre vents genital warts (strong, low),* although there are no data on differences between the vaccines for preventing cervical dysplasia in HIV infected women.

XV. Should Live Vaccines Be Administered to HIV Infected Patients?

- 63. HIV exposed or infected infants should receive rotavi rus vaccine according to the schedule for uninfected infants (strong, low).
- 64. HIV infected patients should not receive LAIV (weak, very low).
- 65. MMR vaccine should be administered to clinically stable HIV infected children aged 1 13 years without severe im munosuppression (strong, moderate) and HIV infected

patients aged ≥ 14 years without measles immunity and with a CD4 T cell lymphocyte count $\geq 200/\text{mm}^3$ (weak, very low).

- 66. HIV infected children with a CD4 T cell percentage <15 (strong, moderate) or patients aged ≥14 years with a CD4 T cell lymphocyte count <200 cells/mm³ should *not* receive MMR vaccine (strong, moderate).
- 67. HIV infected patients should *not* receive quadrivalent MMR varicella (MMRV) vaccine (strong, very low).
- 68. Varicella nonimmune, clinically stable HIV infected patients aged 1 8 years with ≥15% CD4 T lymphocyte per centage (strong, high), aged 9 13 years with ≥15% CD4 T lymphocyte percentage (strong, very low), and aged ≥14 years with CD4 T lymphocyte counts ≥200 cells/mm³ should receive VAR (strong, very low). The 2 doses should be separated by ≥3 months (strong, moderate).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION IN PATIENTS WITH CANCER

XVI. What Vaccines Should Be Given to Patients With Cancer?

- 69. Patients aged ≥6 months with hematological malignan cies (strong, moderate) or solid tumor malignancies (strong, low) *except* those receiving anti B cell antibodies* (strong, moderate) or intensive chemotherapy, such as for induction or consolidation chemotherapy for acute leukemia (weak, low), should receive IIV annually.*
- 70. PCV13 should be administered to newly diagnosed adults with hematological (strong, very low) or solid malignancies (strong, very low) and children with malignancies (strong, very low) as described in recommendations 27a c. PPSV23 should be administered to adults and children aged ≥2 years (strong, low) at least 8 weeks after the indicated dose(s) of PCV13.
- 71. Inactivated vaccines (other than IIV) recommended for immunocompetent children in the CDC annual schedule can be considered for children who are receiving mainte nance chemotherapy (weak, low). However, vaccines admin istered during cancer chemotherapy should *not* be considered valid doses (strong, low) unless there is docu mentation of a protective antibody level (strong, moderate).
- 72. Live viral vaccines should *not* be administered during chemotherapy (strong, very low to moderate).
- 73. Three months after cancer chemotherapy, patients should be vaccinated with inactivated vaccines (strong, very low to moderate) and the live vaccines for varicella (weak, very low); measles, mumps, and rubella (strong, low); and measles, mumps, and rubella varicella (weak, very low) ac cording to the CDC annual schedule that is routinely indicated for immunocompetent persons. In regimens that included anti B cell antibodies, vaccinations should be delayed at least 6 months (strong, moderate).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL TRANSPLANT PATIENTS

XVII. Should HSCT Donors and Patients Be Vaccinated Before Transplantation?

- 74. The HSCT donor should be current with routinely recommended vaccines based on age, vaccination history, and exposure history according to the CDC annual schedule (strong, high). However, administration of MMR, MMRV, VAR, and ZOS vaccines should be avoided within 4 weeks of stem cell harvest (weak, very low). Vaccination of the donor for the benefit of the recipient is *not* recommended (weak, moderate).
- 75. Prior to HSCT, candidates should receive vaccines indicat ed for immunocompetent persons based on age, vaccination history, and exposure history according to the CDC annual schedule if they are not already immunosuppressed (strong, very low to moderate) and when the interval to start of the conditioning regimen is ≥4 weeks for live vaccines (strong, low) and ≥2 weeks for inactivated vaccines (strong, moderate).
- 76. Nonimmune HSCT candidates aged ≥ 12 months should receive VAR (as a 2 dose regimen if there is sufficient time) if they are not immunosuppressed and when the interval to start the conditioning regimen is ≥ 4 weeks (strong, low).

XVIII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Adults and Children After HSCT?

- 77. One dose of IIV should be administered annually (strong, moderate) to persons aged ≥6 months starting 6 months after HSCT (strong, moderate) and starting 4 months after if there is a community outbreak of influenza as defined by the local health department (strong, very low). For children aged 6 months 8 years who are receiving influenza vaccine for the first time, 2 doses should be administered (strong, low).
- 78. Three doses of PCV13 should be administered to adults and children starting at age 3 6 months after HSCT (strong, low). At 12 months after HSCT, 1 dose of PPSV23 should be given pro vided the patient does not have chronic GVHD (strong, low). For patients with chronic GVHD, a fourth dose of PCV13 can be given at 12 months after HSCT (weak, very low).*
- 79. Three doses of Hib vaccine should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT (strong, moderate).
- 80. Two doses of MCV4 should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT to persons aged 11 18 years, with a booster dose given at age 16 18 years for those who received the initial post HSCT dose of vaccine at age 11 15 years (strong, low).
- 81. Three doses of tetanus/diphtheria containing vaccine should be administered 6 months after HSCT (strong, low). For children aged <7 years, 3 doses of DTaP should be administered (strong, low). For patients aged ≥7 years, administration of 3 doses of DTaP should be considered (weak, very low).* Alternatively, a

- dose of Tdap vaccine should be administered followed by either 2 doses of diphtheria toxoid combined with tetanus toxoid (DT) (weak, moderate)* or 2 doses of Td vaccine (weak, low).
- 82. Three doses of HepB vaccine should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT (strong, moderate). If a postvaccina tion anti HBs concentration of ≥10 mIU/mL is not attained, a second 3 dose series of HepB vaccine (strong, low; alterna tive: 1 dose of HepB vaccine after which anti HBs is tested*), using standard dose (strong, moderate) or high dose (40 µg*; weak, low) for children and high dose for adolescents* and adults (strong, low), should be administered.
- 83. Three doses of IPV vaccine should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT (strong, moderate).
- 84. Consider administration of 3 doses of HPV vaccine 6 12 months after HSCT for female patients aged 11 26 years and HPV4 vaccine for males aged 11 26 years (weak, very low).
- 85. Do *not* administer live vaccines to HSCT patients with active GVHD or ongoing immunosuppression (strong, low).
- 86. A 2 dose series of MMR vaccine should be administered to measles seronegative adolescents and adults (strong, low) and to measles seronegative children (strong, moderate) 24 months after HSCT in patients with neither chronic GVHD nor ongoing immunosuppression and 8 11 months (or earlier if there is a measles outbreak) after the last dose of immune globulin intravenous (IGIV).
- 87. A 2 dose series of VAR should be administered 24 months after HSCT to varicella seronegative patients with neither GVHD nor ongoing immunosuppression and 8 11 months after the last dose of IGIV (strong, low).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF SOLID ORGAN TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS

XIX. For Adult and Child Solid Organ Transplant Candidates and Living Donors, Which Vaccines Should Be Administered During Pretransplant Evaluation?

- 88. Living donors should be current with vaccines based on age, vaccination history, and exposure history according to the CDC annual schedule (strong, high); MMR, MMRV, VAR, and ZOS vaccine administration should be avoided within 4 weeks of organ donation (weak, very low). Vaccina tion of donors solely for the recipient's benefit is generally not recommended (weak, low).
- 89. Adults and children with chronic or end stage kidney, liver, heart, or lung disease, including solid organ transplant (SOT) candidates, should receive all age, exposure history, and immune status appropriate vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule for immunocompetent persons (strong, moderate).
- 90. Adult SOT candidates; adults with end stage kidney disease; and pediatric patients who are SOT candidates; are

- aged <6 years and have end stage kidney, heart, or lung disease; or are aged 6 18 years and have end stage kidney disease should receive PCV13 as in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low).
- 91. Adults and children aged ≥2 years who are SOT candidates or have end stage kidney disease should receive PPSV23 if they have not received a dose within 5 years and have not received 2 lifetime doses (strong, moderate). Patients with end stage kidney disease should receive 2 lifetime doses 5 years apart (strong, low). Adults and children aged ≥2 years with end stage heart or lung disease as well as adults with chronic liver disease, including cirrhosis, should receive a dose of PPSV23 if they have never received a dose (strong, low). When both PCV13 and PPSV23 are indicated, PCV13 should be completed 8 weeks prior to PPSV23 (strong, moderate).
- 92. Anti HBs negative SOT candidates should receive the HepB vaccine series (strong, moderate) and, if on hemodial ysis and aged ≥20 years, they should receive the high dose (40 µg) HepB vaccine series (strong, moderate). If a postvac cination anti HBs concentration of ≥10 mIU/mL is not at tained, a second 3 dose series of HepB vaccine (strong, low; alternative: 1 dose of HepB vaccine after which anti HBs is tested*) should be administered, using standard dose (strong, moderate) or high dose* for children (weak, low) and high dose for adolescents* and adults (strong, low). HepA unvaccinated, undervaccinated, or seronegative SOT candidates (particularly liver transplant candidates) aged 12 23 months (strong, moderate) and ≥2 years (strong, moderate) should receive a HepA vaccine series.
- 93. Combined HepA HepB vaccine can be used for SOT candidates aged ≥12 years of age* in whom both vaccines are indicated (strong, moderate).
- 94. The HPV vaccine series should be administered to SOT candidates aged 11 26 years (strong, low moderate).
- 95. SOT candidates aged 6 11 months can receive MMR vaccine if they are not receiving immunosuppression and if transplantation is not anticipated within 4 weeks (weak, very low). If transplantation is delayed (and the child is not receiving immunosuppression), the MMR vaccine should be repeated at 12 months (strong, moderate).
- 96. The VAR should be administered to SOT candidates without evidence of varicella immunity (as defined in rec ommendation 16) if they are not receiving immunosuppres sion and if transplantation is not anticipated within 4 weeks (strong, moderate). The VAR can be administered to varicel la naive SOT candidates aged 6 11 months who are not im munosuppressed provided the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to transplant (weak, very low).* Optimally, 2 doses should be administered ≥3 months apart (strong, low).
- 97. SOT candidates aged ≥60 years (strong, moderate) and varicella positive candidates (as defined in recommendation

- 22) aged 50 59 years (weak, low)* who are not severely im munocompromised should receive ZOS if transplantation is *not* anticipated within 4 weeks.
- XX. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to SOT Recipients?
- 98. Vaccination should be withheld from SOT recipients during intensified immunosuppression, including the first 2 month posttransplant period, because of the likelihood of inadequate response (strong, low). However, IIV can be ad ministered ≥1 month after transplant during a community influenza outbreak (weak, very low).
- 99. Standard age appropriate inactivated vaccine series should be administered 2 to 6 months after SOT based on the CDC annual schedule (strong, low to moderate), including IIV (strong, moderate).
- 100. PCV13 should be administered 2 to 6 months after SOT if not administered before SOT, with the timing based on the patient's degree of immunosuppression, as described in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low to moderate).
- 101. For SOT patients aged ≥2 years, 1 dose of PPSV23 should be administered 2 to 6 months after SOT, with the timing based on the patient's degree of immunosuppression, and ≥8 weeks after indicated doses of PCV13, if not given within 5 years and if the patient has received no more than 1 previous lifetime dose (strong, moderate).
- 102. HepB vaccine should be considered for chronic HepB infected recipients 2 to 6 months after liver transplant in an attempt to eliminate the lifelong requirement for HepB immune globulin (HBIG; weak, low).*
- 103. MMR vaccine and VAR should generally *not* be admin istered to SOT recipients because of insufficient safety and effectiveness data (strong, low), except for varicella in chil dren without evidence of immunity (as defined in recommendation 15) who are renal or liver transplant recipients, are receiving minimal or no immunosuppression, and have no recent graft rejection (weak, moderate).*
- 104. Vaccination should *not* be withheld because of concern about transplant organ rejection (strong, moderate).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC INFLAMMATORY DISEASES ON IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE MEDICATIONS

- XXI. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Chronic Inflammatory Diseases Maintained on Immunosup pressive Therapies?
- 105. Inactivated vaccines, including IIV, should be adminis tered to patients with chronic inflammatory illness treated

- (strong, low moderate) or about to be treated (strong, mod erate) with immunosuppressive agents as for immunocom petent persons based on the CDC annual schedule.
- 106. PCV13 should be administered to adults and children with a chronic inflammatory illness that is being treated with immu nosuppression as described in the standard schedule for children and in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low moderate).
- 107. PPSV23 should be administered to patients aged ≥2 years with chronic inflammatory illnesses with planned initia tion of immunosuppression (strong, low), low level immuno suppression (strong, low), and high level immunosuppression (strong, very low). Patients should receive PPSV23 ≥8 weeks after PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (strong, low).
- 108. VAR should be administered to patients with chronic inflammatory diseases without evidence of varicella immunity (defined in recommendation 15; strong, moderate) ≥ 4 weeks prior to initiation of immunosuppression (strong, low) if treatment initiation can be safely delayed.
- 109. VAR should be considered for patients without evidence of varicella immunity (defined in recommendation 15) being treated for chronic inflammatory diseases with long term, low level immunosuppression (weak, very low).*
- 110. ZOS should be administered to patients with chronic in flammatory disorders who are aged ≥60 years prior to initia tion of immunosuppression (strong, low) or being treated with low dose immunosuppression (strong, very low) and those who are aged 50–59 years and varicella positive prior to initia tion of immunosuppression (weak, low)* or being treated with low dose immunosuppression (weak, very low).*
- 111. Other live vaccines should *not* be administered to patients with chronic inflammatory diseases on maintenance immunosuppression: LAIV (weak, very low), MMR vaccine in patients receiving low level (weak, very low) and high level immunosuppression (weak, very low); and MMRV vaccine in patients receiving low level (weak, very low) and high level immunosuppression (strong, very low).
- 112. Other recommended vaccines, including IIV and HepB vaccine, should *not* be withheld because of concerns about exacerbation of chronic immune mediated or inflammatory illness (strong, moderate).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH ASPLENIA OR SICKLE CELL DISEASES

XXII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Asplenic Patients and Those With Sickle Cell Diseases?

113. Asplenic patients and those with sickle cell diseases should receive vaccines including PCV13 for children aged <2

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 10 of 57

- years, as recommended routinely for immunocompetent persons based on the CDC annual schedule. No vaccine is contraindicated (strong, moderate) except LAIV (weak, very low).
- 114. PCV13 should be administered to asplenic patients and patients with sickle cell diseases aged ≥ 2 years based on the CDC annual schedule for children and in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low moderate).
- 115. PPSV23 should be administered to asplenic patients and patients with a sickle cell disease aged ≥2 years (strong, low) with an interval of ≥8 weeks after PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be administered 5 years later (strong, low).
- 116. For PPSV23 naive patients aged ≥2 years for whom a sple nectomy is planned, PPSV23 should be administered ≥2 weeks prior to surgery (and following indicated dose(s) of PCV13; strong, moderate) or ≥2 weeks following surgery (weak, low).*
- 117. One dose of Hib vaccine should be administered to un vaccinated persons aged ≥5 years who are asplenic or have a sickle cell disease (weak, low).
- 118. Meningococcal vaccine should be administered to pa tients aged ≥2 months who are asplenic or have a sickle cell disease (strong, low), as in recommendation 29. However, MCV4 D should not be administered in patients aged <2 years because of a reduced antibody response to some pneu mococcal serotypes when both MCV4 and PCV are administered simultaneously (strong, low). Revaccination with MCV4 (or MPSV4 for those aged >55 years who have not received MCV4) is recommended every 5 years (strong, low).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH ANATOMIC BARRIER DEFECTS AT RISK FOR INFECTIONS WITH VACCINE-PREVENTABLE PATHOGENS

XXIII. Which Vaccinations Should Be Given to Individuals With Cochlear Implants or Congenital Dysplasias of the Inner Ear or Persistent Cerebrospinal Fluid Communication With the Oropharynx or Nasopharynx?

- 119. Adults and children with profound deafness scheduled to receive a cochlear implant, congenital dysplasias of the inner ear, or persistent cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) communication with the oropharynx or nasopharynx should receive all vaccines recommended routinely for immunocompetent persons based on the CDC annual schedule. No vaccine is contraindicated (strong, moderate).
- 120. Patients with a cochlear implant, profound deafness and scheduled to receive a cochlear implant, or persistent communications between the CSF and oropharynx or nasopharynx should receive PCV13 as described in the standard schedule for children and recommendations 27a c (strong, low moderate).

- 121. Patients aged ≥24 months with a cochlear implant, profound deafness and scheduled to receive a cochlear implant, or persistent communications between the CSF and oropharynx or nasopharynx should receive PPSV23, prefera bly ≥8 weeks after receipt of PCV13 (strong, moderate).
- 122. PCV13 and PPSV23 should be administered ≥2 weeks prior to cochlear implant surgery, if feasible (strong, low).

INTRODUCTION

Vaccination of immunocompromised patients is important because impaired host defenses predispose patients to an in creased risk or severity of vaccine preventable infection. These patients may also have greater exposure to pathogens due to fre quent contact with medical environments [1]; however, vacci nation rates are frequently low [2 4]. Undervaccination of immunocompromised patients may occur because clinicians have insufficient or inaccurate information concerning the safety, efficacy, and contraindication to vaccination of such patients. Specialty clinicians may lack the infrastructure needed to administer vaccines to their at risk patient populations.

Data on safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy/effectiveness of vaccines for immunocompromised populations are limited. Pre licensure studies often exclude immunocompromised persons, and postlicensure studies examine small numbers of immuno compromised patients. These small numbers are problematic when assessing adverse effects [5]. Furthermore, immune defects vary among and within categories of patients with immune defi ciencies (eg, degree of immune deficiency, nutritional status, im munosuppressive regimen), which may limit the generalizability of study findings.

The objective of this guideline is to provide primary care and specialty clinicians with evidence based recommendations for active vaccination of immunocompromised patients and members of their household in order to safely prevent vaccine preventable infections, with the ultimate goal of decreasing asso ciated morbidity and mortality. Recommended vaccination schedules for immunocompetent adults and children as well as certain groups at high risk for vaccine preventable infections are updated and published annually by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), and the American Association of Family Phy sicians [5]. Additional information on vaccination of immuno compromised patients is also available, for example, guidelines for use of specific vaccines and guidelines for particular popula tions [6–14], but comprehensive guidelines are not.

SCOPE OF GUIDELINE

This guideline addresses children and adults with primary (congenital) immune deficiencies; patients with secondary

immune deficiencies due to HIV infection, cancers associated with immune deficiency, cancer chemotherapy, stem cell or solid organ transplant (SOT), sickle cell diseases, and surgical asplenia; and patients with chronic inflammatory diseases treated with systemic corticosteroid therapy, immunomodula tor medications, and/or biologic agents. Vaccination of immunocompetent patients who have an anatomic host defense abnormality (eg, cerebrospinal fluid [CSF] leak) associated with vaccine preventable infections and of individuals living in a household with immunocompromised patients is also addressed. Vaccination of neonates (including premature neo nates), the elderly, burn patients, and pregnant women is beyond the scope of this guideline.

This guideline addresses vaccines routinely recommended on the basis of patient age, social or occupational history, in creased risk of infection related to underlying disease or treat ment of disease, and travel. Vaccines for bioterrorism are not addressed. Immunobiological agents administered for active vaccination are addressed; immune globulin preparations and monoclonal antibodies used for passive vaccination are not. This guideline focuses on vaccines available in the United States, which are often relevant to other areas. Informed consent prior to vaccination, including provision of a CDC vaccine information statement, documentation of the vaccina tion, communication about vaccination to the patient (parent) or to clinicians involved in the patient's care, and discussion of vaccination registries, is beyond the scope of this document. The following 23 clinical questions are answered:

- 1. Who is responsible for vaccinating immunocompromised patients and members of their household?
- 2. When should vaccines be administered to immunocom petent patients in whom initiation of immunosuppressive med ications is planned?
- 3. Which vaccines can be safely administered to individuals living in a household with immunocompromised patients, and what precautions should immunocompromised patients observe after vaccination of household members?
- 4. Which vaccines can be administered to immunocompro mised patients contemplating international travel?
- 5. Should immunocompromised patients or those scheduled to receive immunosuppressive therapy receive varicella vaccine (VAR)?
- 6. Should immunocompromised patients or those who will undergo immunosuppression receive zoster vaccine (ZOS)?
- 7. Should immunocompromised patients receive influenza vaccine?
- 8. Which vaccines should be administered to patients with primary (congenital) complement deficiencies?
- 9. Which vaccines should be administered to patients with phagocytic cell deficiencies (eg, chronic granulomatous disease

- [CGD], leukocyte adhesion deficiency, Chediak Higashi syndrome)?
- 10. Which vaccines should be administered to patients with innate immune defects that result in defects of cytokine genera tion/response or cellular activation (eg, defects of the interfer on gamma/interleukin 12 [IFN γ /IL 12] axis)?
- 11. Which vaccines should be administered to patients with minor antibody deficiencies?
- 12. Which vaccines should be administered to patients with major antibody deficiencies who are receiving immunoglobulin therapy?
- 13. Which vaccines should be administered to patients with combined immunodeficiencies?
- 14. Which inactivated vaccines should be administered to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infected patients?
- 15. Should live vaccines be administered to HIV infected patients?
- 16. Which vaccines should be given to patients with cancer?
- 17. Should hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) donors and patients be vaccinated before transplantation?
- 18. Which vaccines should be administered to adults and children after HSCT?
- 19. For adult and child SOT candidates and living donors, which vaccines should be administered during pretransplant evaluation?
- 20. Which vaccines should be administered to SOT recipients?
- 21. Which vaccines should be administered to patients with chronic inflammatory diseases maintained on immunosuppres sive therapies?
- 22. Which vaccines should be administered to asplenic patients and those with sickle cell diseases?
- 23. Which vaccines should be given to individuals with cochlear implants or congenital dysplasias of the inner ear or persistent CSF communication with the oropharynx or naso pharynx?

METHODOLOGY

Practice Guidelines

"Practice guidelines are systematically developed statements to assist practitioners and patients in making decisions about appropriate healthcare for specific clinical circumstances" [6]. Attributes of good guidelines include validity, reliability, reproducibility, clinical applicability, clinical flexibility, clarity, multidisciplin ary process, review of evidence, and documentation [6].

Panel Composition

The Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) Standards and Practice Guidelines Committee (SPGC) collaborated with partner organizations and convened a panel of 12 experts in vac cination of immunocompromised patients with a goal of devising

recommendations for clinical practice. The panel represented diverse geographic areas, pediatric and adult practitioners, and a wide breadth of specialties (gastroenterology, immunology, infectious diseases, hematology and oncology, rheumatology, and stem cell and solid organ transplantation) and organizations (CDC; American College of Rheumatology; North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition; AAP; Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society; and European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation).

Process Overview and Consensus Development Based on Evidence

Panel subgroups reviewed the initial literature search, selected references, evaluated evidence, drafted recommendations, and summarized the evidence for each section. Published guidelines [7, 8, 15] formed the basis for recommendations on vaccination of patients with HIV or HSCT, with modifications based on newer references and discussion among panel members. The evidence evaluation process was based on the IDSA Handbook on Clinical Practice Guideline Development, which involves a systematic weighting of the quality of evidence and the grade of recommendation using the Grading of Recommendations As sessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system (Table 1) [9].

Drafts were circulated among panel members for commen tary and discussed on 14 occasions by teleconference or in person meeting. Feedback from 3 external peer reviews and endorsing organizations was obtained and used to modify the document. The guideline was reviewed and endorsed by AAP; American Society of Hematology; American Society of Pediat ric Hematology/Oncology; European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation; North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition; and Pediatric In fectious Diseases Society. The guideline was reviewed and ap proved by the IDSA SPGC and board of directors.

Literature Review and Analysis

The expert panel reviewed and analyzed literature published from January 1 1966 plus some more recent publications. Com puterized English language literature searches of the National Library of Medicine PubMed database were performed using the terms "vaccination," "vaccine," "immunization," and names of specific vaccines for each patient population or disorder under consideration. Selected references in selected publications were also reviewed. The literature was limited for many vaccines and patient populations and primarily comprised case series evaluating vaccine immunogenicity and safety in particular populations of immunocompromised patients. There were few comparative or efficacy trials described in the literature.

RESULTS

The results are organized into general sections (vaccine safety, vaccine efficacy, timing of vaccination, vaccination of individu als living in a household with immunocompromised patients, vaccine administration, travel vaccines, varicella and zoster vaccination of immunocompromised patients, influenza vacci nation of immunocompromised patients) and sections on vac cines for specific immunocompromising conditions (primary immune deficiency, HIV infection, oncology, HSCT, SOT, pa tients with chronic inflammatory diseases on immunosuppres sive medications, asplenia, and patients with CSF leaks or cochlear implants). Each section on immunocompromising conditions addresses both inactivated and live vaccines. Recom mendations for vaccination of patients with immunocomprom ising conditions are provided in Tables 2 7. Recommendations not addressed by the CDC ACIP or the AAP Committee on In fectious Diseases or that deviate from their recommendations are marked with an asterisk.

General Principles

Definitions of High- and Low-Level Immunosuppression

The degree of immune impairment in patients with primary or secondary immunodeficiency is variable. For this guideline, certain generalizations have been made. Patients with high level immunosuppression include those:

- with combined primary immunodeficiency disorder (eg, severe combined immunodeficiency),
- receiving cancer chemotherapy,
- · within 2 months after solid organ transplantation,
- with HIV infection with a CD4 T lymphocyte count <200 cells/mm³ for adults and adolescents and percentage <15 for infants and children,
- receiving daily corticosteroid therapy with a dose \geq 20 mg (or >2 mg/kg/day for patients who weigh <10 kg) of prednisone or equivalent for \geq 14 days, and
- receiving certain biologic immune modulators, that is, a tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNF α) blocker or rituximab [14].

After HSCT, duration of high level immunosuppression is highly variable and depends on type of transplant (longer for allogeneic than for autologous), type of donor and stem cell source, and posttransplant complications such as graft vs host disease (GVHD) and their treatments.

Patients with low-level immunosuppression include:

- asymptomatic HIV infected patients with CD4 T lympho cyte counts of 200 499 cells/mm³ for adults and adolescents and percentage 15 24 for infants and children,
- those receiving a lower daily dose of systemic corticoste roid than for high level immunosuppression for \geq 14 days or receiving alternate day corticosteroid therapy, and

Table 2. Vaccination of Persons With HIV Infection

	Low Level or No In	nmunosuppression ^a	High Level Immunosuppression ^b	
Vaccine	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality
Haemophilus influenzae b conjugate	U: age <5 γ R: age 5 18 γ ^c	Strong, hìgh Strong, low	U: age <5 y R: age 5 18 y ^c	Strong, high Strong, low
Hepatitis A	U	Strong, moderate	U: age 1 y	Strong, moderate
Hepatitis B ^d	R	Strong, moderate	R	Strong, moderate
Diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acellular pertussis	V	Strong, very low	U	Strong, very low
Tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid	U	Strong, low	U	Strong, low
Human papillomavirus (HPV4) ^e	U:11 26y	Strong, very low	U:11 26 y	Strong, very low
Influenza inactivated (inactivated influenza vaccine)	U	Strong, high	· U	Strong, high
Influenza live attenuated (live attenuated influenza vaccine)	X'	Weak, very low	X	Weak, very low
Measles, mumps, and rubella live	U: age 12 mo 13 y U: age ≥14 y	Strong, moderate Weak, very low	X: age 12 mo 13 y X: age ≥14 y	Strong, moderate Strong, moderate
Measles, mumps, and rubella varicella live	X	Strong, very low	X	Strong, very low
Meningococcal conjugate ⁹	U: age 11 18 y	Strong, moderate	U: age 11 18 y	Strong, moderate
Pneumococcal conjugate (PCV13)	U: age <5 y R: age 5 y ^h R: age 6 18 γ ^h R: age ≥19 y'	Strong, moderate Strong, moderate Strong, low Strong, low	U: age <5 y R: age 5 y R: age 6 18 y R: age ≥19 y	Strong, moderate Strong, moderate Strong, low Strong, very low
Pneumococcal polysaccharide (PPSV23) ¹	R: age ≥2 y	Strong, moderate	R: age 2 18 y R: adult (CD4 T lymphocytes <200 cells/mm³)	Strong, moderate Weak, low
Polio inactivated (inactivated poliovirus vaccine)	Û	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Rotavirus live	U	Strong, low	U	Weak, very low
Varicella live	U: age 1 8 y U: age ≥9 y	Strong, high Strong, very low	×	Strong, moderate
Zoster live	X	Strong, low	X	Strong, moderate

Abbreviations: R, recommended administer if not previously administered or not current; such patients may be at increased risk for this vaccine preventable infection; U, usual administer if patient not current with recommendations for dose(s) of vaccine for immunocompetent persons in risk and age categories; X, contraindicated.

^a Asymptomatic human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection with CD4 T cell lymphocyte counts of 200 499 cells/mm³ for adults and adolescents and percentages of 15 24 for infants and children.

^b CD4 T cell lymphocyte count <200 cells/mm³ for adults and adolescents and percentage <15 for infants and children.

[°] One dose.

^d High dose hepatitis B vaccine (40 µg) should be considered for adults (weak, moderate) and adolescents (weak, low) with HIV infection. The latter recommendation deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

^{*} Quadrivalent human papillomavirus vaccine (HPV4) is preferred over HPV2 vaccine because of its activity against genital warts. This recommendation deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

f Live attenuated influenza vaccine may be considered in otherwise healthy HIV infected patients aged 5 17 years on combination antiretroviral therapy regimen for ≥16 weeks with CD4.T lymphocyte percentage ≥15 and HIV plasma RNA <60 000 copies.

⁹ For HfV infected patients, meningococcal conjugate vaccine, quadrivalent is administered as a 2 dose primary series separated by ≥2 months. A booster dose (third dose) should be administered at age 16 years if the initial series was given at 11 12 years and at age 16 18 years if the initial series was given at age 13 15 years.

⁶ For patients not fully vaccinated with PCV13 by previous administration.

¹ For patients aged ≥19 years with HIV who have received PPSV23, PCV13 should be administered after an interval of ≥1 year after the last PPSV23 dose (weak, low).

³ PPSV23 should be administered 8 weeks or longer after indicated dose(s) of PCV13. A second dose of PPSV23 should be administered 5 years after the initial dose.

Table 3. Vaccination of Patients With Cancer

	Prior to or Du	ring Chemotherapy	Starting ≥3 mo Postchemotherapy and ≥6 mo Post Anti B Cell Antibodies for Inactivated Vaccines; See Each Live Vaccine for Interval	
Vaccine	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality
Haemophilus influenzae b conjugate	Ua .	Weak, low	Ü	Strong, moderate
Hepatitis A	U ^a	Weak, low	U	Strong, very low
Hepatitis B	. U*	Weak, low	U R: adults	Strong, moderate Strong, very low
Diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis; tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acellular pertussis	U ^a	Weak, low	U: age 0 18 y R: adults with acute lymphoblastic leukemia or lymphoma	Strong, moderate Weak, very low
Human papillomavirus	U: 11 26 y ^a	Weak, very low	U	Strong, very low
Influenza inactivated (inactivated influenza vaccine)	U ^a	Strong, low moderate ^a	U ^b	Strong, moderate
Influenza live attenuated (live attenuated influenza vaccine)	X	Weak, very low	U	Strong, low
Measles, mumps, and rubella live	Xc	Strong, moderate	Starting at 3 mo: U	Strong, low
Measles, mumps, and rubella varicella live	*	Strong, moderate	Starting at 3 mo: U	Weak, very low
Meningococcal conjugate	Ua	Weak, low	U	Strong, low
Pneumococcal conjugate 13 (PCV13)	R: <6 y R: age ≥6 y ^d	Strong, low Strong, very low	U Secretaria	Strong, low
Pneumococcal polysaccharide (PPSV23)	R: age ≥2 y	Strong, low	U assessment of a second of the second of th	Strong, low
Polio inactivated (inactivated poliovirus vaccine)	U ^a	Weak, low	U	Strong, low
Rotavirus live	X	Strong, very low	Not applicable	
Varicella live	X°	Strong, moderate	Starting at 3 mo; U*	Weak, very low
Zoster live	Xc	Strong, very low	Starting at 3 mo: U ^e	Weak, very low

Abbreviations: R, recommended administer if not previously administered or not current; such patients may be at increased risk for this vaccine preventable infection; U, usual administer if patient not current with recommendations for dose(s) of vaccine for immunocompetent persons in risk and age categories; X, contraindicated.

• those receiving methotrexate (MTX) \leq 0.4 mg/kg/week, azathioprine \leq 3 mg/kg/day, or 6 mercaptopurine \leq 1.5 mg/kg/day [10].

Safety of Vaccination of Immunocompromised Persons

Vaccines are categorized as live or inactivated (ie, nonlive vaccines include toxoids and other purified proteins, purified polysaccharide, protein polysaccharide conjugate or

oligosaccharide, inactivated whole or partially purified viruses, and proteins in virus like particles). Limited evidence indicates that inactivated vaccines generally have the same safety profile in immunocompromised patients as in immunocompetent individuals [11]. However, the magnitude, breadth, and persistence of the immune response to vaccination may be reduced or absent in immunocompromised persons.

^a Administer inactivated influenza vaccine (ItV) annually to patients with hematological malignancies (strong, moderate) or solid tumor malignancies (strong, low) except those receiving anti-B cell antibodies such as rituximab or alemtuzumab or intensive chemotherapy such as for induction or consolidation chemotherapy for acute leukemia (weak, low). Administration of inactivated vaccines other than IIV, which are routinely recommended for healthy children in the annually updated CDC recommendations, can be considered for children with malignancies who are receiving maintenance chemotherapy (weak, low). However, vaccines administered while receiving cancer chemotherapy should not be considered valid doses (strong, low). Administration of indicated inactivated vaccines 2 or more weeks prior to chemotherapy is preferred.

billV can be administered ≤3 months after chemotherapy, but response rate may be low.

These live vaccines should not be administered unless the vaccine is otherwise indicated based on the annually updated Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommendations AND the patient is not immunosuppressed AND there will be an interval of ≥4 weeks prior to initiation of chemotherapy.

d For patients aged ≥19 years with human immunodeficiency virus who have received PPSV23, PCV13 should be administered after an interval of ≥1 year after the last PPSV23 dose (weak, low).

Although measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine has been given safely 3 months after completion of chemotherapy, data on the safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy of varicella or zoster vaccine after completion of chemotherapy are not available.

Table 4. Vaccinations Prior to or After Allogeneic or Autologous Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant

	Pre	HSCT	Post HSCT		
Vaccine	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	Recommendation; Earliest Time Posttransplant; Number of Doses	Strength, Evidence Quality	
Haemophilus influenzae b conjugate	U	Strong, moderate	R; 3 mo; 3 doses	Strong, moderate	
Hepatitis A	U	Strong, very low	R; 6 mo; 2 doses	Weak, low	
Hepatitis B	U	Strong, low	R; 6 mo; 3 doses	Strong, moderate	
DTaP, DT, Td, Tdap		Strong, low	R; age <7 y: DTaP; 6 mo; 3 doses R; age ≥7 y: DTaP*; 6 mo; 3 doses OR 1 dose Tdap, then 2 doses DT* or Td; 6 mo	Strong, low Weak, very low DTaP: weak, moderate DT, Td: weak, low	
Human papillomavirus	U: 11 26 y	Strong, very low	U; 6 mo; 3 doses	Weak, very low	
Influenza inactivated (inactivated influenza vaccine)	U	Strong, low	R; 4 mo	Strong, moderate	
Influenza live attenuated (live attenuated influenza vaccine)	X	Weak, very low	X	Weak, very low	
Measles, mumps, and rubella live	U ^a	Strong, very low	X _p	Strong, low	
Measles, mumps, and rubella varicella live	U*	Weak, very low	X	Strong, very low	
Meningococcal conjugate	U	Strong, very low	R; age 11 18 y; 6 mo; 2 doses	Strong, low	
Pneumococcal conjugate (PCV13)	R ^c	Strong, low	R; 3 mo; 3 doses	Strong, low	
Pneumococcal polysaccharide (PPSV23)	R≎	Strong, very low	R; ≥12 mo post if no GVHD	Strong, low	
Polio inactivated (inactivated poliovirus vaccine)	U	Strong, very low	R; 3 mo; 3 doses	Strong, moderate	
Rotavirus live	X	Weak, very low	X	Weak, very low	
Varicella live	U ^a	Strong, low	Χq	Strong, low	
Zoster five	R ^{a,e} : age 50-59 γ* U°: age ≥ 6 0 γ	Weak, very low Strong, low	X X	Strong, low Strong, low	

Abbreviations: DT, diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, DTaP, diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis; GVHD, graft vs host disease; HSCT, hematopoietic stem cell transplant; R, recommended administer if not previously administered or current; such patients may be at increased risk for this vaccine preventable infection; Td, tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, Tdap, Tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acellular pertussis; U, usual administer if patient not current with recommendations for dose(s) of vaccine for immunocompetent persons in risk and age categories; X, contraindicated.

Live vaccines are generally contraindicated in immunodeficient patients because attenuation is relative. However, there are important evidence based exceptions, such as administration of VAR or MMR vaccine to HIV infected children with mild to moderate immune deficiency (Tables 2 7) [7]. It is important to distinguish between contraindications based on clinical evidence and contraindications based on theoretical considerations. Oral polio vaccine (OPV) is contraindicated for patients with severe combined immune deficiency (SCID)

because paralytic poliomyelitis has occurred after vaccination. In contrast, VAR is generally considered contraindicated for children with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) who are receiving 6 mercaptopurine. Also, live, attenuated, cold adapted intranasal influenza vaccine is not administered to immuno compromised patients based on insufficient clinical data to support these judgments. The decision to administer or with hold a vaccine should be based on balancing the burden of the vaccine preventable disease and risk of developing severe or

^a These live vaccines should not be administered unless the vaccine is otherwise indicated based on the annually updated Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommendations AND the patient is not immunosuppressed AND there will be an interval of ≥4 weeks prior to transplant.

b Administer to adolescents and adults (strong, low) and to children (strong, moderate) if measles seronegative, the timing is ≥24 months after transplant, no GVHD is present, and the patient is not receiving immunosuppressive medication. Two doses should be administered.

all not previously administered.

^d Administer if varicella seronegative, the timing is ≥24 months after transplant, no GVHD is present, and the patient is not receiving immunosuppressive medication. Two doses should be administered (strong, low).

^e Consider if the patient is not severely immunosuppressed AND the patient is varicella immune as defined by documentation of age appropriate varicella vaccination, serologic evidence of immunity, documentation of varicella or zoster infection, or birth in the United States before 1980 [45] AND there will be an interval of ≥4 weeks prior to transplant.

^{*}indicates recommendation for a course of action that deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Table 5. Vaccinations Prior to or After Solid Organ Transplant

	Pretrans	splant	Starting 2 6 mo Posttransplant		
Vaccine	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	
Haemophilus influenzae b conjugate	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate	
Hepatitis A	U: age 12 23 mo R: ≥2 y	Strong, moderate Strong, moderate	R, if not completed pretransplant	Strong, moderate	
Hepatitis B	U: age 1-18 y R: ≥18 y	Strong, moderate Strong, moderate	R, if not completed pretransplant ^a	Strong, moderate	
Diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis; tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acellular pertussis	U .	Strong, moderate	U, if not completed pretransplant	Strong, moderate	
Human papillomavirus	U: females 11 26 y U: males 11 26 y	Strong, moderate Strong, low	U: females 11 26y U: males 11 26y	Strong, moderate Strong, low	
Influenza inactivated (inactivated influenza vaccine)	U	Strong, moderate	V	Strong, moderate	
Influenza live attenuated (live attenuated influenza vaccine)		Weak, low	X	Weak, low	
Measles, mumps, and rubella live	R°: 6 11 mo U ^d : age ≥12 mo	Weak, very low Strong, moderate	Χ .	Strong, low	
Measles, mumps, and rubella varicella live	U ^d	Strong, moderate	X	Strong, low	
Meningococcal conjugate	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate	
Pneumococcal conjugate (PCV13)	U: age ≤5 y R: age ≥6 y ^a	Strong, moderate Strong, very low	U: Age 2 5 y R: age ≥6 y if not administered pretransplant ^e	Strong, moderate Strong, very low	
Pneumococcal polysaccharide (PPSV23)	R: age ≥2 y	Strong, moderate	R: age ≥2 y, if not administered pretransplant	Strong, moderate	
Polio inactivated (inactivated poliovirus vaccine)	VU - 2	Strong, moderate	U man 2 mm	Strong, moderate	
Rotavirus live	Ue	Strong, moderate		Strong, low	
Varicella live	R ^f : 6 11 mo U ^d	Weak, very low Strong, low	X 9	Strong, low	
Zoster live	R ^h : age 50 59 y U': age <u>≥</u> 60 y	Weak, low Strong, moderate	X	Strong, low	

Abbreviations: 8, recommended administer if not previously administered or not current; such patients may be at increased risk for this vaccine preventable infection; U, usual administer if patient not current with annually updated Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recommendations for immunocompetent persons in risk and age categories; X, contraindicated.

^{*}Consider hepatitis B vaccine for hepatitis B infected liver transplant patients (weak, low).

⁶ Inactivated influenza vaccine may be administered to solid organ transplant recipients despite intensive immunosuppression (eg, during the immediate posttransplant period), particularly in an outbreak situation (weak, low).

^e Administer only if patient is not immunosuppressed and the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to transplant.

^d Administer only if patient is nonimmune, not severely immunosuppressed, and the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to transplant.

For patients aged ≥19 years who have received PPSV23, PCV13 should be administered after an interval of ≥1 year after the last PPSV23 dose (weak, low).

f Administer only if patient is not immunosuppressed and the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to transplant. This recommendation deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

⁹ Selected seronegative patients with renal or liver transplant have been safely vaccinated. This recommendation deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

^b Administer only if patient is not severely immunosuppressed, the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to transplant, and the patient is varicella immune as defined by documentation of age appropriate varicella vaccination, serologic evidence of immunity, documentation of varicella or zoster infection, or birth in the United States before 1980 [45, 375]. This recommendation deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

¹Administer only if patient is not severely immunosuppressed and the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to transplant.

Table 6. Vaccination of Persons With Chronic Inflammatory Diseases on Immunosuppressive Medications

	Planned Immunosuppression		Low level Immunosuppression ^a		High level Immunosuppression ^a	
Vaccine	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality
Haemophilus influenzae b conjugate	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, low	U	Strong, low
Hepatitis A	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, low	· U	Strong, low
Hepatitis B	TOUGHT THERE	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, low	U	Strong, low
Diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis; tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid; tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acellular pertussis	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, low	U	Strong, low
luman papillomavirus	U: 11 26 y	Strong, moderate	U:11 26 y	Strong, low	U:11 26 y	Strong, very low
nfluenza inactivated (inactivated influenza vaccine)	U .	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
nfluenza live attenuated (live attenuated influenza vaccine)	×	Weak, very low	X	Weak, very low	X	Weak, very low
deastes, mumps, and rubella live	U ^o	Strong, moderate	X	Weak, very low	X	Weak, very low
Measles, mumps, and rubella varicella live	' ∪° '	Strong, low	×	Weak, very low	X	Strong, very low
Meningococcal conjugate	U .	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, low
Pneumococcal conjugate (PCV13)		Strong, moderate	U: <6γ R: ≥6 γ°	Strong, low strong, very low	U: <6y R: ≥6y°	Strong, low strong, very low
Pneumococcal polysaccharide (PPSV23)	R: age ≥2 y	Strong, low	R: age <u>≥</u> 2 γ	Strong, low	R: age ≥2 γ	Strong, very low
Polio inactivated (inactivated poliovirus vaccine)		Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, low
Rotavirus live	υ	Strong, moderate	X	Weak, very low	Χ	Weak, very low
/aricella live	Ω_p	Strong, moderate	Χď	Weak, very low	X	Strong, moderate
Zoster live	R: age 50-59 γ ^e U: age ≥60 γ	Weak, low strong, low	R: age 50 59 γ° U: age ≥60 γ	Weak, very low Strong, very low	X	Weak, very low

Abbrevistions, B, recommended administer if not previously administered or not current, such patients may be at increased risk for this vaccine preventable infection; U, usual administer if patient not current with recommendations for dose(s) of vaccine for immunocompetent persons in risk and age categories; X, contraindicated.

ELow level immunosuppression includes treatment with prednisone <2 mg/kg with a maximum of ≤20 mg/day; methotrexate ≤0.4 mg/kg/week; azathioprine ≤3 mg/kg/day; or 6 mercaptopurine ≤1.5 mg/kg/day. High level immunosuppression and biologic agents such as tumor necrosis factor antagonists or rituximab.

[®] Administer only if patient is nonimmune, not severely immunosuppressed, and the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to initiation of immunosuppressive medications.

^c For patients aged ≥19 years who have received PPSV23, PCV13 should be administered after an interval of ≥1 year after the last PPSV23 dose (weak, low).

d Administration of varicella vaccine can be considered for nonvaricella immune patients treated for chronic inflammatory disease who are receiving long term low dose immunosuppression (week, very low). This recommendation deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

^{*} This recommendation deviates from recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [10].

Table 7. Vaccination of Persons With Asplenia or a Sickle Cell Disease, Cochlear Implants, or Cerebrospinal Fluid Leak

	Asplenia or a Si	ckle Cell Disease	Cochlear Implants ^a or Cerebrospinal Fluid Leak	
Vaccine	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality	Recommendation	Strength, Evidence Quality
Haemophilus influenzae b conjugate	U: age <5 y R: age ≥5 y	Strong, moderate weak, low	U	Strong, moderate
Hepatitis A	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Hepatitis B	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, aceflular pertussis; tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid; tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acellular pertussis	U	Strong, moderate	V	Strong, moderate
Human papillomavirus	U TO THE REAL PROPERTY.	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Influenza inactivated (inactivated influenza vaccine)	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Influenza live attenuated (live attenuated influenza vaccine)	×	Weak, very low	U	Strong, moderate
Meastes, mumps, and rubella live	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Measles, mumps, and rubella varicella live		Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Meningococcal conjugate	R: age 2 55 y ^b .	Strong, low	U	Strong, moderate
Meningococcal polysaccharide	R: age >55 y ^b	Strong, low	U	Strong, moderate
Pneumococcal conjugate (PCV13)	U: age <6 y ^e R: age ≥6 y ^d	Strong, moderate Strong, very low	U: age <6 y ^c R: age ≥6 y ^d	Strong, moderate strong, low
Pneumococcal polysaccharide (PPSV23)	R: age ≥2 y ^e	Strong, low	R: age ≥2 y ^e	Strong, moderate
Polio inactivated (inactivated poliovirus vaccine)	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Rotavirus live	JUNE DESCRIPTION	Strong, moderate	U .	Strong, moderate
Varicella live	U	Strong, moderate	U	Strong, moderate
Zoster live	U	Strong, moderate	Ü	Strong, moderate

Abbreviations: R, recommended administer if not previously administered or not current; such patients may be at increased risk for this vaccine preventable infection; U, usual administer if patient not current with recommendations for dose(s) of vaccine for immunocompetent persons in risk and age categories; X, contraindicated.

life threatening infection with the wild type pathogen and the risks of adverse effects from vaccination.

Concerns have been expressed that antigenic stimulation of vaccination could trigger a flare or onset of chronic inflamma tory disease. The Institute of Medicine recently assessed the relationships between vaccines (MMR, acellular pertussis containing, DT, tetanus toxoid, influenza, HepB, HepA, and HPV vaccines) and adverse effects [5]. Evidence was inade quate to establish or refute a causal relationship between each vaccine and onset or exacerbation of multiple sclerosis, systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), vasculitis, rheumatoid arthritis (RA), or juvenile idiopathic arthritis. Overall, the preponderance of

clinical evidence indicates that vaccines are not important trig gers of disease flares in such patients and should not be withheld for that reason (see "Recommendations for Vaccination of Pa tients with Chronic Inflammatory Diseases of Immunosuppres sive Medications" section).

For SOT patients, concerns have been raised that vaccination might trigger rejection. However, the preponderance of clinical evidence, most relating to trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine (IIV), indicates that vaccines are not important triggers of rejection episodes and should not be withheld for that reason (see "Recommendations for Vaccination of Solid Organ Transplant Recipients" section).

a includes patients with profound hearing loss who are scheduled to receive a cochlear implant or have inner ear cerebrospinal fluid communication.

^bA 2 dose primary series should be administered with an additional dose every 5 years.

[°]Two doses of PCV13 for children aged 2.5 years who have not received doses of PCV or received <3 doses of PCV7.

¹ If PCV13 has not been administered. For patients aged ≥19 years who have received PPSV23, PCV13 should be administered after an interval of ≥1 year after the last PPSV23 dose (weak, low).

e Administer 8 or more weeks after indicated dose(s) of PCV13 with a single revaccination with PPSV23 5 years after the initial dose (strong, moderate).

Vaccine Efficacy and Effectiveness

There are few data on vaccine efficacy or effectiveness in immu nocompromised patients. In children with sickle cell disease, there was a 93% reduction in the rate of invasive pneumococcal disease caused by vaccine serotypes after routine administration of 7 valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine (PCV7) [12]; however, herd type immunity may have contributed to vaccine effectiveness. Other examples are the demonstrated efficacy of IIV in HIV infected adults [13] and cardiac transplant patients, and the efficacy of VAR against severe varicella in renal and liver transplant recipients [16–18], children with leukemia [19], and children with HIV [20].

The estimate of effectiveness of most vaccines in immuno compromised patients is based on a surrogate marker, typically serum antibodies against the pathogen. However, there are lim itations to the use of antibody measurements for determination of the adequacy of preexisting immunity or a response to vacci nation. For many pathogens, a serum antibody concentration that correlates with protection (eg, a protective concentration of antibodies to ≥1 proteins of Bordetella pertussis) has yet to be established [21, 22]. Asplenic patients may require a higher antibody concentration than immunocompetent persons in order to protect against invasive infection with Streptococcus pneumoniae and Haemophilus influenzae type b [23, 24]. The correlation of antibody concentration with protection may be imperfect because such assays do not measure antibody func tional activity [25]. Assays of functional antibodies [26] or antibody avidity [27] may be more predictive of protection. For prevention of zoster, cell mediated immunity (CMI) is more closely associated with protection than are serum antibody con centrations [28].

Guideline and Conflict of Interest

All panel members complied with the IDSA's policy on conflict of interest, which requires disclosure of any financial or other interest that might be construed as constituting an actual, potential, or apparent conflict. They were provided IDSA's conflict of interest disclosure statement and asked to identify ties to companies that develop products that might be affected by promulgation of the guideline. Information was requested regarding employment, consultancies, stock ownership, honoraria, research funding, expert testimony, and membership on company advisory committees. The panel decided on a case by case basis whether conflict should limit member participation. Poten tial conflicts are listed in the Acknowledgments section.

Revision Dates

At annual intervals, the panel chair, SPGC liaison advisor, and SPGC chair will determine the need for guideline revisions by reviewing the current literature. If necessary, the entire panel will be reconvened. When appropriate, the panel will

recommend revisions to the IDSA SPGC, board, and other collaborating organizations for review and approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR VACCINATIONS

I. Who Is Responsible for Vaccinating Immunocompromised Patients and Members of Their Household?

Recommendations

- 1. Specialists who care for immunocompromised patients share responsibility with the primary care provider for en suring that appropriate vaccinations are administered to im munocompromised patients (strong, low).*
- 2. Specialists who care for immunocompromised patients share responsibility with the primary care provider for recommending appropriate vaccinations for members of immunocompromised patients' households (strong, very low).*

Evidence Summary

In many cases, immunocompromised patients visit specialists more frequently than they do their primary care clinician, providing opportunities for vaccination. For example, vaccination rates were higher among pregnant women offered influenza vaccine by their obstetrician or other specialty provider compared with those not offered vaccine (70.8% vs 14.4%) [29]. Therefore, specialists are in a pivotal position to ensure vaccination by administering vaccines or providing specific advice to patients and primary care providers. Specialists should educate patients and members of their household on the importance of vaccination of household members for the protection of the immunocompromised patient.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TIMING OF VACCINATION

II. When Should Vaccines Be Administered to Immunocompe tent Patients in Whom Initiation of Immunosuppressive Medi cations is Planned?

Recommendations

- 3. Vaccines should be administered prior to planned immu nosuppression if feasible (strong, moderate).
- Live vaccines should be administered ≥4 weeks prior to immunosuppression (strong, low) and should be avoided within 2 weeks of initiation of immunosuppression (strong, low).*
- 5. Inactivated vaccines should be administered ≥2 weeks prior to immunosuppression (strong, moderate).

Evidence Summary

Certain immunocompromised patients have a window of opportunity before initiation of immunosuppressive medications

Table 8. Safety of Administration of Live Vaccines to Contacts of Immunocompromised Persons

Live Vaccine	Shedding of Agent? (site)	Transmissibility from Vaccinated Immunocompetent Person?	Recommendation for Administering Vaccines (When Indicated) to Healthy Immunocompetent Contacts of Immunocompromised Patients
Influenza, live, attenuated nasal	Yes (nasal secretions)	Rare (from 1 vaccinated toddler)	Administer (strong, low); vaccinated persons to avoid close contact with persons with hematopoietic stem cell transplant or severe combined immune deficiency for 7 d (weak, very low)
Measles, mumps, and rubella	Measles: no Mumps: no Rubella: yes (nasopharynx, in low titer; breast milk)	No, except mother to infant transmission of rubella vaccine virus via breast milk	Administer (strong, moderate)
Polio, oral	Yes (stool)	Yes, with rare cases of vaccine associated paralytic poliomyelitis	Do not administer (strong, high)
Rotavirus, oral	Yes (stool)	Yes, but no reported cases of symptomatic infection in contacts	Administer (strong, low)
Typhoid, oral	No. . 17 1,000 100 400 400 400 400 400 400 400 400	No	Administer (strong, low)
Varicella	Yes (skin lesions)	Rare, limited to vaccinees with skin lesions	Administer (strong, moderate); if skin lesions develop, avoid close contact with immunocompromised persons
Yellow fever	No, except possibly shed in breast milk	Yes (at least 3 cases of encephalitis in infants exposed to the vaccine via nursing)	Administer (strong, moderate) except to women who are nursing
Zoster	Yes (rarely recovered from injection site vesicles)	Not reported	Administer to those aged ≥60 y (strong, moderate); if skin lesions develop, avoid close contact with immunocompromised persons

during which indicated vaccines can be administered while the patient is immunocompetent (or more immunocompetent than following initiation of immunosuppression). However, in dicated treatment of underlying disease should not be delayed to achieve vaccination goals. Response to vaccination and safety of live vaccines is higher prior to initiation of immunosuppres sion. After administration of live viral vaccines, the period of viral replication and development of immunologic response is generally <3 weeks, so vaccination ≥4 weeks prior to immuno suppression (2 weeks prior for inactivated vaccines) is likely to be safe [16]. Development of a robust immune response may take longer than these time intervals, however, particularly if the vaccination is for primary vaccination rather than as a booster.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS OF IMMUNOCOMPROMISED PATIENTS

Reduction of exposure to vaccine preventable infections is im portant for risk reduction. This can be accomplished by educating immunocompromised patients and members of their household on infection control practices and by vaccinating household members and healthcare contacts to provide a "circle of protection." For example, influenza vaccination of

healthcare personnel at a long term care facility for elderly patients reduced mortality more than vaccination of the patients [30, 31]. All members of the immunocompromised patient's household as well as all healthcare contacts should be vaccinated. Requiring annual influenza vaccination of healthcare personnel can increase vaccination rates [32]. However, data supporting the effectiveness of vaccinating adults to protect young infants from pertussis are limited [33]. Household members should be up to date with all routinely recommended vaccinations including annual influenza vaccine [34].

III. Which Vaccines Can Be Safely Administered to House hold Members of Immunocompromised Patients, and What Precautions Should Immunocompromised Patients Observe After Vaccination of Household Members?

Recommendations (Table 8)

- 6. Immunocompetent individuals who live in a household with immunocompromised patients can safely receive inactivated vac cines based on the CDC ACIP's annually updated recommend ed vaccination schedules for children and adults (hereafter, CDC annual schedule; strong, high) or for travel (strong, moderate).
- Individuals who live in a household with immunocom promised patients age ≥6 months should receive influenza vaccine annually (strong, high). They should receive either:

- (a) Inactivated influenza vaccine (IIV; strong, high) or
- (b) Live attenuated influenza vaccine (LAIV) provided they are healthy, not pregnant, and aged 2–49 years (strong, low). Exceptions include individuals who live in a household with an immunocompromised patient who was a hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) recip ient within 2 months after transplant or with graft vs host disease (GVHD) or is a patient with severe com bined immune deficiency (SCID).* In these exceptions, LAIV should not be administered (weak, very low) or, if administered, contact between the immunocompro mised patient and household member should be avoided for 7 days (weak, very low).
- 8. Healthy immunocompetent individuals who live in a household with immunocompromised patients should receive the following live vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule: combined measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccine (strong, moderate); rotavirus vaccine in infants aged 2 7 months (strong, low); varicella vaccine (VAR; strong, moderate); and zoster vaccine (ZOS; strong, moderate). Also, these individuals can safely receive the following vaccines for travel: yellow fever vaccine (strong, moderate) and oral typhoid vaccine (strong, low).
- OPV should *not* be administered to individuals who live in a household with immunocompromised patients (strong, moderate).
- 10. Highly immunocompromised patients should avoid handling diapers of infants who have been vaccinated with rotavirus vaccine for 4 weeks after vaccination (strong, very low).
- 11. Immunocompromised patients should avoid contact with persons who develop skin lesions after receipt VAR or ZOS until the lesions clear (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

When transmission of live vaccine from a vaccine recipient occurs, illness from an attenuated vaccine strain is likely to be less severe than from wild type virus or bacteria. Studies of vaccine virus shedding after vaccination with LAIV have dem onstrated that 80% of healthy recipients aged 8 36 months shed vaccine virus strains for a mean duration of 7.6 days [35] 40]. Among 345 patients aged 5 49 years, 30% had detectable virus in nasal secretions after receiving LAIV. Duration and amount of shedding correlated inversely with age, and maximal shedding occurred within 2 days of vaccination [36, 41]. LAIV virus was transmitted in a day care center to 1 healthy toddler who remained asymptomatic. Based on this single case, the es timated frequency of transmission is 0.6% 2.9% among tod dlers attending a day care center [40]. Transmission of LAI virus to an immunocompromised person has not been demonstrated despite nonrestrictive recommendations for LAIV administration to household members. Although data are limited, it is considered safe to administer LAIV to individuals who live with immunocompromised persons except for HSCT recipients in protected environments with positive air pressure and hepa filtered air [41]. HSCT patients within 2 months after transplant or with GVHD and patients with a primary SCID are likely to be severely immunocompromised; therefore, in the opinion of the panel, household members should not receive LAIV.

The only report of transmission of MMR viruses from im munocompetent vaccinees involved transmission to nursing neonates of rubella vaccine virus via breast milk [42]. Yellow fever encephalitis developed in at least 3 nursing infants following yellow fever vaccination of their mothers [43].

Transmission of varicella virus from immunocompetent persons has been limited to vaccinees who developed a rash, and the risk appears to be low [44, 45]. Therefore, susceptible household members should receive VAR to protect immuno compromised persons from potential exposure to wild type disease. Household members aged ≥60 years who qualify for zoster vaccination should be vaccinated. Individuals with a VAR or ZOS associated rash may be contagious and should avoid close contact with immunocompromised persons until the lesions have resolved [45–47].

Children receiving rotavirus vaccines may shed live virus in stool for 2 4 weeks and transmit vaccine virus, but sympto matic disease is rare [48, 49]. In a study of 110 pairs of infant twins in which 1 twin was given a 2 dose monovalent rotavirus vaccine (RV1; Rotarix, GlaxoSmithKline) series and the other placebo, the transmission rate was 18.8% (95% confidence interval [CI], 10.9% 29.0%), but none of the affected infants became symptomatic [50]. The risk of transmission and the theoretical risk of developing rotavirus disease as a result of the contact are lower than the risk of an unimmu nized infant developing rotavirus diarrhea with wild type virus with resultant rotavirus disease in the immunocompro mised contact.

Healthcare personnel should receive influenza vaccine annually and receive HepB, VAR, MMR, and Tdap vaccines or provide documentation of immunity to minimize exposure of immunocompromised persons in healthcare facilities. Manda tory annual influenza vaccination, recommended by multiple professional organizations, has been implemented in certain healthcare facilities, resulting in very high influenza vaccine coverage [36, 51–53].

OPV, which is administered internationally, but not in the United States, is associated with a risk of transmission to household members, with a small risk of vaccine associated paralytic poliomyelitis (VAPP) in those household members. The risk is higher in immunocompromised individuals living with a vaccinee [54, 55].

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 22 of 57

Vaccine Administration

Most vaccine doses and routes are the same for immunocom promised and immunocompetent persons. An exception is HepB vaccine for adult hemodialysis patients whose regimen is 3 or 4 40 µg doses vs 3 10 or 20 µg doses for immunocompe tent adults receiving Recombivax (Merck) or Engerix (GlaxoS mithKline), respectively [56], or for certain HIV infected patients not responding to standard regimens [57, 58] (see HIV section). Certain immunocompromised patients may have thrombocytopenia that may be a relative contraindication to an intramuscular injection. Clinical experience suggests that intra muscular injections are safe if the platelet count is ≥30 000 50 000 cells/mm³, a ≤23 gauge needle is used, and constant pressure is maintained at the injection site for 2 minutes [59]. Inactivated poliovirus (IPV) vaccine and pneumococcal poly saccharide vaccine 23 (PPSV23) may be administered subcuta neously. An intradermal IIV is licensed. Multiple indicated vaccines can be administered simultaneously, with the same recommendations as for immunocompetent persons.

VACCINES FOR INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL

IV. Which Vaccines Can Be Administered to Immunocompro mised Persons Contemplating International Travel?

Recommendations

- 12. Clinicians may administer inactivated vaccines indicated for travel based on the CDC annual schedule for immuno competent adults and children (strong, low).
- 13. Yellow fever vaccine generally should *not* be adminis tered to immunocompromised persons (strong, moderate). If travel to an endemic area cannot be avoided, vaccination can be considered in the following minimally immunocom promised human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infected individuals:
- (a) asymptomatic HIV infected adults with CD4 T cell lymphocyte count ≥200 cells/mm³ (weak, low)
- (b) asymptomatic HIV infected children aged 9 months 5 years with CD4 T cell lymphocyte percentages of ≥15 (weak, very low).
- 14. With certain exceptions (eg, yellow fever vaccine and MMR vaccine in certain HIV infected patients [see recom mendation 13 and HIV section] and in certain HSCT patients [see HSCT section]), live vaccines should *not* be given to immunocompromised persons (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

The immunocompromised person's vaccination status should be assessed and vaccinations updated as needed before travel [60, 61]. Helpful information can be found at the CDC Travel ers' Health website and in the "Yellow Book CDC Information for International Travel" (both at http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel).

Immunocompromised persons should avoid travelling to areas where yellow fever is endemic [62]. Data are very limited on yellow fever vaccine in immunocompromised persons. In vestigators recently studied the effect of yellow fever vaccine in 70 patients with rheumatic diseases including RA, SLE, and spondyloarthropathies who were treated with immunosuppres sive drugs [63]. Mild adverse effects (eg, rash, myalgia, elevated hepatic transaminases) occurred in 22.5% of vaccinees, suggest ing a reasonably safety profile. However, sample size was inade quate for detecting rare serious complications, and cases of yellow fever vaccine associated viscerotropic disease have been reported in this population [62]. Yellow fever vaccine has been safely administered to a limited number of post HSCT patients [64 66] and to more than 200 HIV infected adults, the majori ty of whom had CD4 T cell lymphocyte counts >200 cells/mm³ [62, 67, 68]. An increase in relapse of multiple sclerosis was noted in 7 yellow fever vaccine recipients [69].

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VAR AND ZOS IN IMMUNOCOMPROMISED PATIENTS

VAR

V. Should Immunocompromised Patients or Those Scheduled to Receive Immunosuppressive Therapy Receive VAR?

Recommendations

- 15. VAR should be given to immunocompetent patients without evidence of varicella immunity (ie, age appropriate varicella vaccination, serologic evidence of immunity, clini cian diagnosed or verified history of varicella or zoster, or laboratory proven varicella or zoster; strong, moderate) if it can be administered ≥4 weeks before initiating immunosup pressive therapy (strong, low).
- 16. A 2 dose schedule of VAR, separated by >4 weeks for patients aged ≥13 years and by ≥3 months for patients aged 1 12 years, is recommended if there is sufficient time prior to initiating immunosuppressive therapy (strong, low).
- 17. VAR should *not* be administered to highly immunocom promised patients. However, certain categories of patients (eg, patients with HIV infection without severe immunosup pression or with a primary immune deficiency disorder without defective T cell mediated immunity, such as primary complement component deficiency disorder or chronic granulomatous disease [CGD]) should receive VAR, adhering to a 2 dose schedule separated by a 3 month inter val (strong, moderate).
- 18. VAR can be considered for patients without evidence of varicella immunity (defined in recommendation 16) who are

receiving long term, low level immunosuppression (weak, very low).*

19. VAR should be administered to eligible immunocom promised patients as the single antigen product, not VAR combined with MMR vaccine (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

Varicella severity and mortality are increased in children and adults for many conditions associated with immune compro mise and immunosuppressive therapy [70, 71]. VAR, which contains live attenuated VZV (Oka strain), is not licensed for use in immunocompromised patients because of its potential to cause severe disease in patients who lack sufficient T cell mediated immune responses [72 74].

Varicella vaccination with sufficient time prior to immuno suppression is useful in patients without evidence of varicella immunity (defined in recommendation 16). Immune response is nearly optimal in 2 to 3 weeks, and replicating VZV should be cleared after 3 weeks. Vaccine related rash, which has oc curred up to 42 days after vaccination, is uncommon after 21 days in immunocompetent vaccinees [46, 75]. Vaccine virus given in the week before starting therapy for malignancy was associated with 1 death and has resulted in reactivation of VZV that subsequently became resistant to antiviral drugs [73, 76, 77]. A 2 dose schedule that is separated by \geq 28 days for those aged ≥13 years and by ≥3 months for children aged 12 months 12 years is desirable for maximal protection. Most VAR studies of immunocompromised children used a single dose; therefore, the potential for protection is likely greater than what has been reported to date. Some immunocompro mised patients had lower immune response to VAR than that observed in immunocompetent persons [78, 79].

Malignancy. Leukemic children on maintenance chemother apy were vaccinated within a specific window for timing of che motherapy and lymphocyte concentration threshold. Two doses induced either VZV specific humoral immunity or CMI, or both, in >90% of vaccinees [19, 80, 81] and resulted in >85% efficacy after household exposure. VAR was safely administered to >50 Japanese children with nonlymphoma tumors with clin ical and immunological outcomes similar to those for acute leu kemia [82, 83]. The results of >10 other small vaccination studies in approximately 150 children with solid tumors closely replicated the Japanese experience.

Varicella vaccination in children with leukemia was often complicated, however, by systemic reactions (eg, fever and dis seminated rash in 40%) that affected the chemotherapy sched ule and required treatment with acyclovir [73, 82, 84]. Severe reactions have occurred in children with other malignancies [82]. Additional arguments against the use of VAR in children with malignancies include the following: (1) children who re ceived VAR prior to immunosuppression may retain protective immunity, (2) risk of exposure to varicella has diminished, (3) antiviral agents are available for treatment, (4) chemotherapy regimens change frequently and often are more immunosup pressive than those under which varicella vaccination was studied, and (5) protection will likely be superior if vaccination occurs after significant immune recovery.

The CDC ACIP recommends that patients on chemotherapy or radiation for hematopoietic malignancies receive live virus vaccines when in remission and off therapy for ≥ 3 months with evidence of substantial CMI recovery [11, 45].

HSCT. Safety and immunogenicity were satisfactory when VAR was administered to a small number of HSCT recipients (allogeneic and autologous) at 12 24 months posttransplanta tion when they were not immunosuppressed and met criteria similar to those for other immunocompromised children [85]. More than 30 additional allogeneic HSCT recipients safely re ceived 2 doses of VAR 24 months after transplant when they were off therapy, had no GVHD, had a normal phytohemag glutinin or mitogen response, and had a CD4 T cell lympho cyte count ≥200 cells/mm³ [86]. At least 85% developed specific antibody, generally in association with VZV specific CMI. Similarly, VAR was safely administered ≥2 years after HSCT to 46 children who were off immunosuppression, had a CD4 T cell lymphocyte count ≥200 cells/mm³, and had re sponded to ≥1 other vaccine [87]. VAR is commonly safely ad ministered ≥24 months after successful HSCT. The clinical efficacy of VAR in this situation has not been established. The presence or absence of anti varicella antibody is not likely an accurate predictor of protection, since VZV specific CMI is es sential for recovery from VZV infections. Patients receiving VAR must not be receiving prophylactic anti herpes viral therapy or immune globulin therapy because these treatments interfere with vaccine effect.

Renal transplant. Varicella vaccination after renal transplan tation, within carefully controlled limits of maintenance immu nosuppression and immunologic specifications, was well tolerated. At 6 12 months after vaccination, 75% 85% had VZV antibody. Mild varicella occurred 2 4 years after vaccina tion in 3 of 34 patients [17].

Liver transplant. VAR was administered after liver transplanta tion to 15 varicella naive children and to 7 previously vaccinated children who had lost their VZV antibody. These patients were ≥6 months posttransplantation, were on limited dosages of im munosuppressive medications, and had not been treated for re jection episodes during the prior month. No safety issues were identified. Immune responses were good, and 10 varicella expo sures occurred without subsequent varicella [16, 18].

HIV infection. Approximately 100 children aged <8 years with HIV safely received VAR without alterations in their CD4 T cell lymphocyte percentage or count or in their plasma viral load [79, 88]. They had a baseline CD4 T cell lymphocyte

percentage \geq 15 and most were on combination antiretroviral therapy (cART). Two doses administered 3 months apart re sulted in good immune responses similar to those in HIV infected children convalescing from natural varicella, which appeared not to pose risk for repeat infection. Effectiveness of VAR in HIV infected children is suggested by several long term follow up studies with effectiveness in preventing varicella (82%) and zoster (100%) [20, 89]. Optimal timing for vaccina tion is after \geq 3 months of successful cART [79].

Other immunosuppressive conditions. Patients with cellular immune deficiencies, patients receiving immunosuppressive drugs similar in type and dose to those used for the conditions mentioned above, and patients receiving high dose steroid therapy should not receive VAR [90, 91]. VAR was safe and im munogenic in 25 pediatric patients with rheumatic diseases who were receiving MTX, and no disease flares were associated with vaccination [92, 93]. Six pediatric patients with IBD on im munosuppressive therapy who received VAR tolerated it and had good immune responses; however, 5 of them received their initial dose of VAR prior to immunosuppression [92]. There are no data on VAR in patients receiving biological immuno suppressants, patients receiving drugs that deplete B cells or antagonize costimulatory molecules, or varicella naive immu nocompromised adults. Since adults are less responsive to VZV antigens and more susceptible to varicella complications than children, there is additional uncertainty about vaccination timing for adults who have been severely immunosuppressed. Most advisory groups indicate that adult vaccination should be guided by recommendations for children; however, VAR should be administered only when an immunocompromised adult has substantially recovered from immunosuppression.

MMRV vaccine has not been evaluated in immuno compromised patients and should not be administered to persons with primary or secondary immunodeficiency because it contains ≥7 fold more VZV than monovalent VAR. When administered as a first dose to immunocompetent children aged <4 years, it is significantly more likely to cause fever and febrile seizures than MMR vaccine and VAR administered sepa rately [94, 95].

Herpes Zoster Vaccine

The incidence and severity of herpes zoster (HZ) increase with age and also with degree of immune compromise. ZOS is not licensed for use in highly immunocompromised patients for the same reasons as those against administration of VAR to these patients. Two differences that may be relevant are that ZOS contains 14 fold more (at expiry) live VZV than does VAR and most immunocompromised patients at risk for HZ (except al logeneic HSCT patients) had previously developed primary VZV immunity and should have residual VZV specific immune memory, even with immunosuppression.

VI. Should Immunocompromised Patients or Those Who Will Undergo Immunosuppression Receive ZOS?

Recommendations

- 20. ZOS should be given to patients aged ≥60 years if it can be administered ≥4 weeks before beginning highly immuno suppressive therapy (strong, low).
- 21. ZOS should be considered for varicella positive patients (ie, persons with a history of varicella or zoster infection or who are varicella zoster virus [VZV] seropositive with no previous doses of VAR) aged 50 59 years if it can be admin istered ≥4 weeks before beginning immunosuppressive therapy (weak, low).*
- 22. ZOS should be administered to patients aged ≥60 years who are receiving therapy considered to induce a low level of immunosuppression (strong, low).
- 23. ZOS should *not* be administered to highly immunocom promised patients (strong, very low).

Evidence Summary

Persons with varicella immunity that was induced by VAR are at lower risk for HZ than those with a history of varicella disease and should not receive ZOS. In some clinical situations, immunosuppression that results in increased risk for zoster can be delayed for a significant period of time (eg, prior to organ transplantation, chemotherapy, use of biological modifiers); however, urgent treatments should not be delayed. ACIP sug gests administering $ZOS \ge 2$ weeks prior to immunosuppres sion [10]; the panel suggests 4 weeks for all live vaccines. A strong VZV specific response to ZOS occurs within 2 weeks in immunocompetent persons [96].

ZOS should be considered in varicella positive patients (ie, persons with a history of varicella or zoster infection or are VZV seropositive with no previous doses of VAR) who will undergo immunosuppressive therapy and are aged 50 59 years. Some vaccine boosted immunity may persist during immuno suppression and attenuate, if not prevent, subsequent HZ.

ZOS will likely be well tolerated in patients receiving low dose immunosuppressive therapies defined by the ACIP as "not sufficiently immunosuppressive to cause concerns for vaccine safety" [10], such as low dose prednisone (<2 mg/kg; maximum \leq 20 mg/day), MTX (\leq 0.4 mg/kg/week), azathioprine (\leq 3 mg/kg/day), and 6 mercaptopurine (\leq 1.5 mg/kg/day). ZOS was well tolerated in a cohort of 62 adults with hematological malig nancies, including 31 with stem cell transplant (autologous, 26; allogeneic, 5), except for 1 patient who experienced trigeminal zoster 3 weeks after vaccination [97]. Vaccine efficacy in these patient populations is unknown.

Absence of safety and efficacy data precludes ZOS in patients on biological immunosuppressants. However, clinical features of HZ that developed in >100 patients receiving TNF α modulators

for RA resulted in acceptable severity, suggesting that such pa tients could tolerate the less pathogenic VZV in ZOS [98, 99]. Risk of zoster is higher for patients receiving anti TNF α anti bodies than for those receiving TNF α antagonists [98]. Data on zoster vaccination of varicella immune immunocompromised patients aged <50 years are limited. Preliminary results of zoster vaccination in 286 HIV infected adults on stable antiretroviral therapy showed safety and immunogenicity.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INFLUENZA VACCINE IN THE IMMUNOCOMPROMISED HOST

VII. Should Immunocompromised Patients Receive Influenza Vaccine?

Recommendations

- 24. Annual vaccination with IIV is recommended for immu nocompromised patients aged ≥6 months (strong, moderate) except for patients who are very unlikely to respond (although unlikely to be harmed by IIV), such as those receiving inten sive chemotherapy* (strong, low) or those who have received anti B cell antibodies within 6 months* (strong, moderate).
- 25. LAIV should *not* be administered to immunocompro mised persons (weak, very low).

Evidence Summary

IIV can be safely administered to and is indicated annually for all immunocompromised patients aged ≥6 months including patients receiving immunosuppressive therapy for chronic in flammatory disease, oncology patients receiving chemotherapy, immunosuppressed transplant patients, HIV patients, and primary immunodeficiency patients (eg, common variable immune deficiency [CVID]) [100 104]. Patients aged <9 years who have never received influenza vaccine or received only 1 dose in the previous season should be vaccinated with 2 doses given 1 month apart [41]. Relatively small observational studies support the immunogenicity of IIV in all these groups except primary immunodeficiency patients. Data summarized else where in this guideline emphasize the safety of IIV in immuno compromised populations. Immune response to IIV is good in most children with IBD or rheumatologic inflammatory illness es, except those receiving anti TNF α antibodies. Immune re sponse is often poor in cancer chemotherapy patients; in adults receiving azathioprine, infliximab, or rituximab; and in SOT re cipients receiving mycophenolate. A single study of antibody deficient patients on immunoglobulin therapy showed poor immunogenicity but no safety issues [105].

LAIV is contraindicated in immunocompromised patients because the risks are unknown in most populations. It has been studied in HIV infected patients and 28 children with

malignancies, among whom no safety issues were identified [38, 39, 106, 107]. LAIV and IIV were compared in 243 pediatric patients with HIV infection aged 5 17 years on a stable cART regimen [39]. Safety and immunogenicity of both vaccines were similar to those reported in immunocompetent children.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH PRIMARY IMMUNODEFICIENCY DISORDERS

Primary immunodeficiency disorders are a heterogeneous group that includes genetic congenital disorders that affect the functioning of either the innate or adaptive immune systems [108]. Defects of the adaptive immune system are divided into defects in antibody production alone or defects in T cells that result in combined (cell and antibody mediated) immunodeficiency. Depending on the type of disorder, the impaired immune response may result in vaccine failure or, with live vaccines, vaccine associated disease. However, vaccination can be safe and effective in many situations. Vaccination of asplenic patients is addressed in question XXII.

VIII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Primary (Congenital) Complement Deficiencies?

Recommendations

- 26. Patients with primary complement deficiencies should receive all routine vaccines based on the CDC annual sched ule; none are contraindicated (strong, low).
- 27. Patients with primary complement deficiencies and who
- (a) aged 2 5 years should receive 1 dose of pneumococcal conjugate vaccine (PCV)13 if they have received 3 doses of PCV (either 7 valent PCV [PCV7] or PCV13) before age 24 months and 2 doses of PCV13 (8 weeks apart) if they have received an incomplete schedule of ≤2 doses of PCV7 (PCV7 or PCV13) before age 24 months (strong, low).
- (b) aged 6 18 years with a classic pathway (C1, C2, C3, C4), alternate pathway, or severe mannan binding lectin (MBL) deficiency who have not received PCV13 should receive a single dose of PCV13 (strong, very low).
- (c) aged ≥19 years with a classic pathway (C1, C2, C3, C4), alternate pathway, or severe MBL deficiency who are PCV13 naive should receive a single dose of PCV13 (strong, very low). For those who have received PPSV23, PCV13 should be administered ≥1 year after the last PPSV23 dose (weak, low).
- 28. Patients aged ≥2 years with an early classic pathway, al ternate pathway, or severe MBL deficiency should receive PPSV23 ≥8 weeks after PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (strong, low).

- 29. Patients with primary complement deficiencies should receive conjugate meningococcal vaccine. A 4 dose series of bivalent meningococcal conjugate vaccine and Haemophilus influenzae type b conjugate vaccine (HibMenCY; MenHi brix, GlaxoSmithKline) should be administered at age 2, 4, 6, and 12 15 months for children aged 6 weeks 18 months (strong, low) or a 2 dose primary series of meningococcal conjugate vaccine, quadrivalent (MCV4) should be adminis tered to patients with primary complement component defi ciency at age 9 months 55 years (MCV4 D [Menactra, Sanofi Pasteur] for those aged 9 23 months; MCV4 D or MCV4 CRM [Menveo, Novartis] for those aged 2 54 years; strong, low). For persons aged >55 years, MPSV4 should be administered if they have not received MCV4 and MCV4 should be administered if they have received MCV4 (strong, low). For patients aged 9 23 months, the doses should be administered 3 months apart; for patients aged ≥2 years, the doses should be administered 2 months apart. MCV4 D should be administered ≥4 weeks after a dose of PCV13 because of a reduced antibody response to some pneumo coccal serotypes when MCV4 D and PCV7 are administered simultaneously (strong, low).
- 30. Patients with a primary complement component deficiency should be revaccinated with MCV4 (or MPSV4 for those aged >55 years who have not received MCV4) every 5 years (strong, low) [109].

Evidence Summary

Immunogenicity of MPSV4 has been demonstrated in patients with complement deficiencies [110 116]. Revaccination is needed to maintain levels of antibody to both MPSV4 [113, 115] and MCV4 [117 119]. Occasional reports of poor or aber rant antibody responses in patients with early classic complement component deficiency [120 123] support the potential (not established) importance of monitoring antibody responses in this subset. CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of PCV13 for immunocompromised persons [109, 124]. MCV4 D can in terfere with the response to some serotypes of PCV7 when both are administered simultaneously [481].

Since influenza may predispose to invasive bacterial respira tory infection [125, 126], annual influenza vaccination is important in this group. Influenza vaccine has not been studied in patients with complement deficiencies, but safety is likely similar to that in immunocompetent persons.

IX. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Phagocytic Cell Deficiencies (eg, CGD, Leukocyte Adhe sion Deficiency, Chediak Higashi Syndrome)?

Recommendations

31. Patients with phagocytic cell deficiencies should receive all inactivated vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule

- (strong, low). Children aged 2 5 years should receive PCV13 as in recommendation 27a (weak, very low).
- 32. Patients aged ≥6 years with phagocytic cell deficiencies other than CGD (unless patient with CGD is receiving im munosuppressive medication) should receive PCV13 as in recommendations 27b and 27c (weak, very low).
- 33. Patients aged ≥2 years with phagocytic cell deficiencies other than CGD (unless patient with CGD is receiving im munosuppressive medication) should receive PPSV23 ≥8 weeks after receipt of PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (weak, low).
- 34. Live bacterial vaccines, such as bacillus Calmette Guérin (BCG) or oral typhoid vaccine, should *not* be administered to patients with a phagocytic cell defect (strong, moderate).
- 35. Live viral vaccines should be administered to patients with CGD and to those with congenital or cyclical neutrope nia (weak, low).
- 36. Live viral vaccines should *not* be administered to patients with leukocyte adhesion deficiency, defects of cytotox ic granule release such as Chediak Higashi syndrome (see section on combined immunodeficiencies), or any other undefined phagocytic cell defect (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

For inactivated vaccines, but not for live viral vaccines except in CGD patients, patients with phagocytic cell defects should have normal immune responses and the same adverse effects as immu nocompetent individuals. Patients with CGD are not at increased risk for infections with pneumococcus [127, 128], and there is limited data on the risk of invasive pneumococcal infection in patients with other phagocytic cell defects [127, 128]. There are no data on which to base a recommendation for live, oral rotavirus vaccine in CGD patients with IBD. Staphylococcus aureus is a major pathogen in individuals with phagocytic defects. Because influenza infection may predispose to respiratory infection with this organism [129], annual influenza vaccination is important.

Live vaccines, especially viruses, should be avoided in patients with leukocyte adhesion deficiency or cytotoxic granule release defects (eg. Chediak Higashi syndrome) because the defective cytotoxicity of T and natural killer (NK) cells results in abnormal immune response [130, 131]. Since some defects that affect neutrophil function may also affect lymphocyte function and potentially depress response to live vaccines, individuals with phagocytic defects undefined at a molecular level should not receive live vaccines. Dissemination of BCG can occur in CGD patients [132 135]. There are no reported cases of vaccine associated disease caused by live oral typhoid vaccine in CGD patients. However, nontyphoidal salmonella infection is the most common cause of bacteremia [127], con firming poor control of this group of organisms. Therefore, live oral typhoid vaccine should be avoided in CGD patients.

X. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Innate Immune Defects Resulting in Defects of Cytokine Generation/Response or Cellular Activation (eg. Defects of the Interferon gamma/Interleukin 12 Axis)?

Recommendations

- 37. Patients with innate immune defects that result in defects of cytokine generation/response or cellular activation should receive all inactivated vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule (strong, very low).
- 38. For patients with innate immune defects that result in defects of cytokine generation/response or cellular activa tion, PCV13 should be administered as in recommendations 27a c (weak to strong, very low to low).
- 39. The advice of a specialist should be sought regarding in dividual conditions concerning use of live vaccines in patients with innate immune defects that result in defects of cytokine generation/response or cellular activation/inflammation generation (strong, low).
- 40. Live bacterial vaccines should *not* be administered to pa tients with defects of the interferon gamma/interleukin 12 (IFN γ/IL 12) pathways (strong, moderate).
- 41. Live viral vaccines should *not* be administered to patients with defects of IFN (alpha or gamma) production (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

There is a group of heterogeneous defects of innate immunity in which cytokine generation or response and resultant cellular activation and inflammation are abnormal. In some cases, functioning of the adaptive immune response may also be af fected. Inactivated vaccines often induce adequate immune re sponses without serious adverse events in patients with defects of cytokine generation/response or cellular activation (eg, defects of the IFN γ /IL 12 axis). However, given the increasing variety of newly recognized disorders, an immunologist should be consulted. Many have increased susceptibility to mycobacte rial infections including disseminated BCG [136–140]. Many molecular defects can result in defects of antiviral immunity [141, 142], contraindicating the use of live viral vaccines.

XI. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Minor Antibody Deficiencies?

Recommendations

- 42. Patients with immunoglobulin (Ig)A deficiency or spe cific polysaccharide antibody deficiency (SPAD) should receive all routine vaccinations based on the CDC annual schedule, provided that other components of their immune systems are normal (strong, low).
- 43. Children with SPAD or ataxia telangiectasia should receive PCV13 as described in recommendations 27a c

- (weak to strong, very low to low). Those aged ≥ 2 years should receive PPSV23 ≥ 8 weeks after indicated doses of PCV13, and a second dose should be given 5 years later (strong, low).
- 44. Monitoring of vaccine responses can be useful for assess ing the degree of immunodeficiency of patients with minor antibody deficiencies and level of protection (weak, moder ate).
- 45. OPV should *not* be administered to IgA deficient pa tients (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

Patients with minor antibody deficiencies are likely to be able to mount at least partial antibody responses to vaccines, which may aid in the assessment of the degree of immunodeficiency. In some instances, apparently minor antibody deficiencies are associated with a CMI defect (eg, DiGeorge syndrome [143, 144]), which is an important consideration before giving live vaccines. In SPAD [145], protein polysaccharide conjugate vaccines will, to some extent, overcome the defect and produce some antibody response [146].

In ataxia telangiectasia, response to PPSV23 is, for the most part, poor. In small studies, PCV7 was immunogenic in most patients, although not comparable to immunocompetent con trols [147–149]. OPV should not be administered to IgA deficient patients [150–152].

XII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Major Antibody Deficiencies Receiving Immunoglobulin Therapy?

Recommendations

- 46. Inactivated vaccines other than IIV are *not* routinely ad ministered to patients with major antibody deficiencies during immunoglobulin therapy (strong, low).
- (a) For patients with suspected major antibody deficien cies, all inactivated vaccines can be administered as part of immune response assessment prior to immunoglob ulin therapy (strong, low).
- 47. IIV can be administered to patients with major antibody deficiencies and some residual antibody production (weak, low).
- 48. Live OPV should *not* be administered to patients with major antibody deficiencies (strong, moderate).
- 49. Live vaccines (other than OPV) should *not* be adminis tered to patients with major antibody deficiencies (weak, low).*

Evidence Summary

Most patients with major antibody deficiency disorders will be on immunoglobulin replacement therapy in order to receive continual passive immunity. Vaccination with live or inactivated vaccines is rarely undertaken in patients receiving immunoglobulin for complete agammaglobulinemia. These patients will not have antibody response, although a T cell response that aids recovery from some viral infections is possible.

IIV can be useful in patients with an incomplete deficiency of antibody production who are receiving immunoglobulin re placement therapy. In these patients, it is possible that the im munoglobulin does not contain antibodies against circulating strains of influenza, and T cell mediated responses are likely to contribute to protection from severe disease. Some patients with CVID responded to polysaccharide and protein vaccine antigens; the magnitude of response may have correlated with clinical severity of the immunodeficiency [153 155]. Adults with major humoral immunodeficiencies, mainly on immuno globulin therapy, had very poor responses to IIV, particularly those with CVID, but had some response to the A (H1N1) component [105].

VAPP is a recognized complication of major antibody deficiency syndromes [156–158], but the absence of chronic OPV secretors among 2 sizeable cohorts of antibody deficient patients suggests that the condition is rare [159, 160]. There is no published evidence of harm from inactivated vaccines unique to this patient population.

Live virus vaccines should be avoided since the risk is unknown and they are unlikely to lead to protection because of preexisting neutralizing antibody from administered immuno globulin.

XIII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Combined Immunodeficiencies?

Recommendations

- 50. For patients with suspected combined immunodeficien cies, all inactivated vaccines can be administered as part immune response assessment prior to commencement of immunoglobulin therapy (strong, low).
- (a) For patients with combined immunodeficiencies who are receiving immunoglobulin therapy, inactivated vac cines should *not* be routinely administered (strong, low).
- 51. For patients with combined immunodeficiencies and re sidual antibody production potential, IIV can be adminis tered (weak, very low).
- 52. Children with partial DiGeorge syndrome (pDGS) should undergo immune system assessment with evaluation of lymphocyte subsets and mitogen responsiveness in order to determine whether they should be given live viral vaccines. Those with ≥500 CD3 T cells/mm³, ≥200 CD8 T cells/mm³, and normal mitogen response should receive MMR vaccine and VAR (weak, low).*
- 53. Patients with SCID, DGS with a CD3 T cell lymphocyte count <500 cells/mm³, other combined immunodeficiencies

with similar CD3 T cell lymphocyte counts, Wiskott Aldrich syndrome, or X linked lymphoproliferative disease and familial disorders that predispose them to hemophago cytic lymphohistiocytosis should *avoid* all live vaccines (strong, moderate).

Evidence Summary

Vaccines are often administered before diagnosis of combined immune deficiency. Inactivated vaccines do not cause significant adverse effects, whereas live vaccines (eg, rotavirus) may produce chronic infection in patients with combined immune deficiency [161 163]. Immunity in DGS patients varies from normal to complete athymia. With a CD3 T cell lymphocyte count >500 cells/mm³ and normal mitogen response, MMR and VZV vaccines are safe and produce high seroconversion rates [164 166]; however, antibody levels may fall significantly after 1 year [167] (a finding of unclear clinical significance). There are no published data on live virus vaccination in other partial T cell defects. Extrapolation from HIV infected persons suggests that a CD4 T cell lymphocyte count ≥200 cells/mm³ (adults) or percentage ≥15 (children) is a reasonable criterion but is of uncertain validity.

T cell deficient children receiving live viral vaccines have de veloped VAPP [168], disseminated measles infection including pneumonitis [169–171], and chronic rotavirus infection [161–163, 172] after receiving the relevant vaccines. In disorders that predispose to hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis (eg, perfor in deficiency), immune response to viruses is abnormal because of defective cytotoxicity of T and NK cells. Therefore, live vaccines should be avoided [173]. Disseminated BCG may be the presenting feature of SCID or it may develop during stem cell transplantation [174].

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF HIV-INFECTED ADULTS, ADOLESCENTS, AND CHILDREN

XIV. Which Inactivated Vaccines Should Be Administered to HIV Infected Patients?

Recommendations (Table 2)

54. HIV infected patients should be vaccinated according to the CDC annual schedule for the following inactivated vaccines: IIV (strong, high); PCV13 in patients aged <2 years (strong, moderate); *H. influenzae* type b conjugate (Hib) vaccine (strong, high); diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis (DTaP) vaccine (strong, moderate); tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acel lular pertussis (Tdap) vaccine (strong, very low); tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid (Td) vaccine (strong, low); hepatitis B (HepB) vaccine (strong, moderate); hepatitis A

(HepA) vaccine (strong, moderate); inactivated poliovirus (IPV) vaccine (strong, moderate); and quadrivalent human papillomavirus (HPV4) vaccine* in females and males aged 11 26 years (strong, very low) with additions noted below.

- 55. PCV13 should be administered to HIV infected patients aged ≥2 years as in recommendations 27a c (Table 2; strong, low to moderate).
- 56. PPSV23 should be administered to HIV infected chil dren aged ≥2 years who have received indicated doses of PCV (strong, moderate), HIV infected adults with CD4 T lymphocyte counts of ≥200 cells/mm³ (strong, moderate), and HIV infected adults with CD4 T lymphocyte counts of <200 cells/mm³ (weak, low). PPSV23 should be given ≥8 weeks after indicated dose(s) of PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (strong, low).
- 57. HIV infected children who are aged >59 months and have not received Hib vaccine should receive 1 dose of Hib vaccine (strong, low). Hib vaccine is *not* recommended for HIV infected adults (weak, low).
- 58. HIV infected children aged 11 18 years should receive a 2 dose primary series of MCV4 2 months apart (strong, moderate). A single booster dose (third dose) should be given at age 16 years if the primary series was given at age 11 or 12 years and at age 16 18 years if the primary series was given at age 13 15 years (strong, low). If MCV4 is adminis tered to HIV infected children aged 2 10 years because of risk factors for meningococcal disease, a 2 dose primary series of MCV4 should be administered with a 2 month in terval between doses, and a booster dose should be given 5 years later (strong, very low).
- 59. HIV infected patients should receive the HepB vaccine series (strong, moderate), with consideration of high dose HepB vaccine (40 μg/dose) for adults (weak, moderate) and adolescents* (weak, low). One to 2 months after completion, patients should be tested for anti HBs (antibodies to HepB surface antigen; strong, low). If a postvaccination anti HB concentration of ≥10 mIU/mL is not attained, a second 3 dose series of HepB vaccine (strong, low; alternative: 1 dose of HepB vaccine after which anti HBs is tested*), using stan dard dose (strong, moderate) or high dose (40 μg*; weak, low) for children and high dose for adolescents* and adults (strong, low), should be administered.
- 60. HepB vaccine containing 20 µg of HepB surface antigen (HBsAg) combined with HepA vaccine (HepA HepB; Twinrix), 3 dose series, can be used for primary vaccination of HIV infected patients aged ≥12 years (strong, moderate).*
- 61. Internationally adopted HIV infected children who have received doses of OPV should receive a total of 4 doses of a combination of OPV and IPV vaccine (strong, low).
- 62. HPV4 vaccine is recommended over bivalent human papillomavirus (HPV2) vaccine because HPV4 vaccine

prevents genital warts (strong, low),* although there are no data on differences between the vaccines for preventing cer vical dysplasia in HIV infected women.

Evidence Summary

Administration of inactivated vaccines to HIV infected persons appears safe as no increases in adverse effects or HIV specific adverse effects have been recognized. However, data are not sufficient to comment on rare adverse effects. Concern about acceler ating progression of the HIV infection is unfounded. A transient increase in plasma HIV viral load may occur after vaccination in children not receiving cART but this resolves in 2 to 6 weeks [102, 175, 176]. Patients receiving cART do not experience significant changes in viral load or T cell concentrations after administration of either live or inactivated vaccines [79, 177 181]. In general, live vaccines are contraindicated in HIV infected persons with low CD4 T cell lymphocyte counts or percentages.

Vaccination guidelines for HIV infected adolescents and adults have been published by the CDC, National Institutes of Health (NIH), and HIV Medical Association (HIVMA) of IDSA [8]; guidelines for HIV infected children have been published by CDC, NIH, HIVMA of IDSA, Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society, and AAP [7].

HIV infected children often have lower antibody and CMI responses to vaccines than immunocompetent persons, al though these responses may still be protective [79, 88, 177 180, 182]. The vaccine induced responses correlate with the adequa cy of the CD4+ T cell pool and plasma HIV load at the time of vaccination, each of which is an independent predictor of the magnitude of the immune response [79, 177, 178, 180, 183]. In some, but not all, studies, the CD4+ T cell lymphocyte percent age at the time of vaccination in children on a stable cART regimen is a better predictor of response than is the nadir per centage count prior to starting cART [79, 177 179]. Antibody levels from prior vaccination may increase after cART even in the absence of a vaccine boost. Responses to vaccines are signif icantly better in patients who have been on cART ≥ 3 months, specifically after improvement in the CD4+ T cell lymphocyte percentage (optimally ≥15) and reduction in plasma HIV viral load (optimally to <1000 copies/mL), suggesting that vaccina tions should be delayed until cART has been undertaken [184].

Influenza Vaccination With IIV

Antibody responses to IIV are blunted in patients who have un treated HIV [185–187] and are improved in patients who do not have progressive HIV disease and/or are receiving cART [188]. Efficacy of IIV in HIV infected adults was established in 5 controlled trials; efficacy and clinical effectiveness ranged from 27% to 78% [13, 189]. In HIV infected adults, IIV was not associated with increased or unusual adverse effects, although rare adverse effects may not have been detected [41]. In contrast

with previous reports [190, 191], subsequent prospective trials found no significant long term difference in HIV RNA levels between influenza vaccinated and unvaccinated HIV positive patients [192, 193]. The monovalent 2009 pandemic A (H1N1) vaccine was immunogenic in HIV infected children but less immunogenic in HIV infected adults than in HIV uninfected adults [194]. No safety issues were identified [181, 195], al though the presence of the adjuvant "Adjuvant System 03" (ASO₃) was associated with a small increase in plasma HIV RNA in 1 study [176].

Pneumococcal Vaccination.

PCV is safe and efficacious [196 199] in HIV infected children and is more immunogenic than PPSV23 [200 202]. However, the antibody produces decays more rapidly than in uninfected children, has lower functional activity, and the anamnestic re sponse is blunted [203]. Two doses of PCV7 were safely admin istered to HIV infected children aged <18 years on cART, followed by 1 dose of PPSV23 [178]. The antibody response was excellent and persistence was similar to that observed in uninfected children. Although PCV13 has not been studied in HIV infected children, PCV13 has replaced PCV7 in the vacci nation schedule [124, 204]. A randomized, controlled trial of PCV7 in HIV infected adults in Malawi, the majority of whom were not on antiretroviral therapy, showed that the vaccine was safe and had an efficacy of 75% in preventing recurrent invasive pneumococcal infection [205]. CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of a single dose of PCV13 for immunocompro mised adults [109].

PPSV23 efficacy has been studied primarily in adults/adoles cents with CD4 T lymphocyte counts ≥200 cells/mm³. Most studies have shown that PPSV23 reduces pneumococcal bacter emia and decreases mortality in HIV infected adults [206 208]. However, 1 study performed in Uganda found an increase in pneumococcal disease in vaccine recipients [209]. Although efficacy is uncertain for individuals with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm³, PPSV23 should be offered to such patients with consideration of revaccination once antiretroviral therapy has resulted in a CD4 count ≥200 cells/mm³.

Haemophilus influenzae Type b Vaccination

HIV infected children not on cART are less likely to respond to Hib vaccine, and their antibody responses often fall below levels associated with long term protection (≥0.15 μg/mL) within 1 year [210]. Nevertheless, Hib vaccination was highly effective over a 2 year period in HIV infected children in South Africa [182, 211] and Malawi [212].

Meningococcal Vaccination

As in immunocompetent persons, MCV4 is preferred over MPSV4 for HIV patients aged 9 months 54 years and can be

given to immunocompetent adults without concern for hypores ponsiveness if the recipient has received MPSV [213, 214]. If MCV4 is administered to HIV infected children aged ≥2 years, a 2 dose primary series of MCV4 should have a 2 month interval between doses [215, 216]. A single dose of MCV4 was safely ad ministered to 320 HIV infected children aged >11 years on cART with a CD4 T cell lymphocyte percentage ≥15 [215] and to children aged 2 11 years with a CD4 T cell lymphocyte per centage ≥25. Antibody against ≥1 serotype showed a 4 fold increase to 1 or more antigens in 88% of vaccinees and in 50% 70% of individual serotypes. Although antibody levels were sig nificantly lower than in HIV uninfected children, protective titers were present in 55% 90% (depending on serotype) after vaccination. Antibody levels fell approximately 50% in the 6 months after vaccination. A 2 dose regimen of MCV4 was ad ministered to 59 HIV infected children aged 2 10 years with a good safety profile and generally good immunogenicity that varied with serogroup [216]. Response after a single MCV4 dose was high to serogroup A (92%) and W 135 (98%); responses im proved after a second dose for serogroup C (from 43% to 80%; P < .0001) and serogroup Y (from 76% to 84%; P = 38).

Diphtheria, Tetanus, Pertussis Vaccination

Children with HIV often have low to undetectable levels of anti-body against pertussis, diphtheria, and tetanus [179, 217 221] after receiving 3 or 4 doses of Diphtheria toxoid, whole cell per tussis, tetanus toxoid vaccine (DPT) or diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis (DTaP) vaccine. Booster vaccination of HIV infected children with DTaP is safe and does not significantly affect the CD4 T lymphocyte cell count or HIV RNA levels [179, 221]. Although the booster dose of DTaP vaccine significantly increases anti pertussis [179] and anti tetanus [218] antibody levels, they remain significantly lower than those induced in uninfected children after a primary series or a booster dose at 4 to 6 years. The efficacy of primary or booster DTaP vaccination in HIV infected children is unknown. Tdap vaccination has not been studied in HIV infected children or adults.

Hepatitis B Vaccination

HepB infection is commonly acquired by infants born to mothers dually infected with HepB virus (HBV) and HIV. The efficacy of infant prophylaxis against HBV, HepB, and HepB immune globulin (HBIG) within 12 hours of birth in the presence of HIV infection is unknown. However, prophylaxis is likely to minimize, but not entirely prevent, mother to child transmission [222]. Children born to HIV infected mothers should receive their first dose of HepB vaccine before hospital discharge [223].

HepB vaccine is indicated and can be safely given to HIV infected patients, but immunogenicity is lower than in HIV negative adults. Only 18% 72% of HIV positive persons

develop protective concentrations of antibodies to HepB surface antigen (HBsAg), which are generally lower in magnitude and wane more quickly than in adults without HIV infection [56, 224–226]. Low CD4 count and ongoing HIV viremia are associated with poor vaccine responses [57, 225–228]. In patients not receiving cART, only 30% 50% develop a protective antibody response (anti HBs concentration of \geq 10 mIU/mL in immunocompetent persons) [229]. However, protective levels are reached in 60% 70% of vaccinees receiving cART, with responsiveness proportional to the percentage of CD4+ T lymphocytes and the extent of virus suppression [230–234].

The frequent failure of the primary vaccine series is the ratio nale for testing for anti HBs after the third dose of vaccine. When antibody was absent after the standard primary series, a subsequent single booster dose significantly increased the number of vaccinees with protective antibody levels in 2 studies [230, 235] but led to only a small increase in another study [229]. Repeating a 3 dose series induced protective antibody levels in >75% of patients who failed an initial series [236]. However, this response also declined quickly after boosting, even when vaccines containing a higher content of HBsAg were used [230, 233, 236]. Doubling the HepB vaccine dosage from 20 µg to 40 µg significantly increased seroconversion rates [57, 58]. In the pre cART era, the dose of HBsAg was successfully doubled for HIV infected children [237]. All strategies are more successful in patients who are on cART. In HIV infected patients aged 12 20 years who received primary vaccination with a 3 dose series of high dose HepB vaccine (40 µg of HBsAg; given as Engerix B, as is done for dialysis patients) or a combined HepA HepB vaccine (Twinrix), the response rate (73% 75% seroresponse) was superior to that with standard HepB vaccine containing 20 µg of HBsAg (Engerix B; 60% seroresponse) [233, 238]. A similar outcome occurred with a 3 dose series of high dose HepB vaccine among 267 adult HIV infected patients with CD4 T lymphocyte counts >200 cells/ mm³, the majority of whom were receiving antiretroviral therapy [58]. Seroreversion is also common. Approximately 30% of HIV infected children who were vaccinated while re ceiving cART did not have seroprotective antibody levels 3 years after vaccination, but 82% had an anamnestic response to a single additional dose of HepB vaccine [239]. The importance of persistent anti HBs is unclear. There is no evidence in HIV uninfected children that loss of antibody after successful vacci nation results in subsequent clinically significant infection or chronic infection [240].

For HIV infected patients who are negative for HBsAg and anti HBs but are anti HBc (antibodies to HepB core antigen) positive, there is a possibility of recrudescence of past, occult HBV infection and vaccination recommendations vary. Some data suggest that these patients are not HBV immune and should receive a complete vaccine series [241, 242], while

others suggest a single dose of vaccine followed by anti HBs testing 2 weeks later. Current guidelines from the CDC, NIH, and the HIV Medicine Association of the IDSA for the preven tion and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV infected adolescents and adults recommend giving the complete series in patients with a positive isolated HBV core antibody and a negative test for HBV DNA [8].

Hepatitis A Vaccination

HepA is immunogenic in HIV infected patients, and no safety issues were identified in more than 300 vaccinees [177, 243, 244]. Almost 100% of HIV infected children on cART with a CD4 T cell lymphocyte percentage ≥20 25 seroconverted [245]. Younger HIV infected children have antibody responses similar to those of uninfected vaccinees, but responses are 10 to 50 fold lower in older children with a longer duration of HIV infection. HIV infected persons should be vaccinated against HepA prior to a decline in CD4 counts to improve the likelihood of an adequate response. Although responses are better in patients who respond to cART, vaccination should not be delayed in at risk patients. Seroreversion occurs in 10% of HIV infected vaccinees within 2 years, but a third dose of HepA vaccine is safe and generates high antibody titers that are similar in magnitude to those achieved with 2 doses in unin fected persons. Eighty five percent of HIV infected adults maintained seropositive antibodies 6 to 10 years after 2 doses of vaccine [246].

Polio Vaccination

Anti polio antibody concentrations after IPV vaccination are lower in HIV infected children who are not receiving cART than in uninfected children [247]. Also, booster responses in untreated HIV infected adults are significantly blunted [248].

HPV Vaccination

HPV4 vaccine was safe and immunogenic when administered to 126 HIV infected children aged 7 11 years with CD4 T lym phocyte percentages ≥15 [180]. However, there are no data re garding safety and efficacy of either vaccine in HIV positive adolescents. HPV4 vaccine was safe and immunogenic in 109 HIV infected adult males [249]. For HIV infected patients, HPV4 vaccine is preferred over HPV2 vaccine because of the protection afforded by HPV4 vaccine against genital warts, which are more prevalent and more subject to relapse in HIV infected patients than in HIV uninfected persons [250].

XV. Should Live Vaccines Be Administered to HIV Infected Patients?

Recommendation (Table 2)

63. HIV exposed or infected infants should receive rotavi rus vaccine according to the schedule for uninfected infants (strong, low).

- 64. HIV infected patients should *not* receive LAIV (weak, very low).
- 65. MMR vaccine should be administered to clinically stable HIV infected children aged 1 13 years without severe im munosuppression (strong, moderate) and HIV infected pa tients aged ≥14 years without measles immunity and with a CD4 T cell lymphocyte count ≥200/mm³ (weak, very low).
- 66. HIV infected children with a CD4 T cell percentage <15 (strong, moderate) or patients aged ≥14 years with a CD4 T cell lymphocyte count <200 cells/mm³ should *not* receive MMR vaccine (strong, moderate).
- 67. HIV infected patients should *not* receive quadrivalent MMR varicella (MMRV) vaccine (strong, very low).
- 68. Varicella nonimmune, clinically stable HIV infected patients aged 1 8 years with ≥15% CD4 T lymphocyte per centage (strong, high), aged 9 13 years with ≥15% CD4 T lymphocyte percentage (strong, very low), and aged ≥14 years with CD4 T lymphocyte counts ≥200 cells/mm³ should receive VAR (strong, very low). The 2 doses should be separated by ≥3 months (strong, moderate).

Evidence Summary

Rotavirus Vaccination

HIV infection is neither a contraindication nor a precaution for the 2 licensed live attenuated rotavirus vaccines for HIV infect ed or HIV exposed infants [251]. To date, rotavirus vaccine trials in resource poor countries, which invariably involved administration to HIV infected infants, have not uncovered unusual or severe adverse events. Monovalent live rotavirus vaccine (RV1; Rotarix; GlaxoSmithKline) was safe and immu nogenic in 178 HIV infected infants including 13 with CD4 T lymphocyte percentages <25 [252, 253]. Pentavalent live rota virus vaccine (RV5; RotaTeq; Merck) has been associated with persistent, severe diarrhea in infants with SCID [162]. There are no data on the efficacy of rotavirus vaccines in HIV infected children.

LAI Vaccination

LAIV is not licensed for administration to immunocompro mised patients and is not recommended by the CDC for immu nocompromised patients. LAIV was safely administered to 188 HIV infected children and adults who fulfilled certain clinical and immunologic criteria [38, 39, 106]. The immune response to LAIV in HIV infected patients was comparable to that in uninfected individuals [38, 39, 106].

MMR Vaccination

The prevalence and titer of measles antibody is low in measles vaccinated HIV infected children, even if they are receiving cART [218, 254 257]. Rubella antibody titers are also reduced in HIV infected children with significant immune suppression

[258, 259]. MMR vaccine was safely administered to HIV in fected children with \geq 15% CD4 T lymphocytes in >1200 pa tients [260, 261]. However, some severe complications occurred in children with lower CD4 T cell lymphocyte percentages or counts [262]. Titers of MMR antibodies increased after cART in previously vaccinated patients, but \geq 50% remained seroneg ative. Administration of an additional dose of MMR vaccine to children on cART who had \geq 15% CD4 T lymphocytes induced detectable measles antibody in 75% 90% [218, 257, 260], rubella antibody in >90%, and mumps antibody in >60% [260]. No significant adverse effects have been associated with vaccine administration in adults with CD4 counts >200 cells/mm³ [263].

Varicella Vaccination

ACIP recommends varicella vaccination for HIV positive chil dren with mild to moderate immune suppression based on safety data [45, 79, 256]. No data exist regarding vaccine safety or efficacy in HIV infected adults (see Varicella section).

Zoster Vaccination

Preliminary data on zoster vaccination in HIV infected adults on stable antiretroviral therapy showed safety in 286 patients and immunogenicity (see Zoster vaccine section).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION IN PATIENTS WITH CANCER

XVI. Which Vaccines Should Be Given to Patients With Cancer?

Recommendations (Table 3)

- 69. Patients aged ≥6 months with hematological malignan cies (strong, moderate) or solid tumor malignancies (strong, low) *except* those receiving anti B cell antibodies* (strong, moderate) or intensive chemotherapy, such as for induction or consolidation chemotherapy for acute leukemia (weak, low), should receive IIV annually.*
- 70. PCV13 should be administered to newly diagnosed adults with hematological (strong, very low) or solid malig nancies (strong, very low) and children with malignancies (strong, very low) as described in recommendations 27a c. PPSV23 should be administered to adults and children aged ≥2 years (strong, low) at least 8 weeks after the indicated dose(s) of PCV13.
- 71. Inactivated vaccines (other than IIV) recommended for immunocompetent children in the CDC annual schedule can be considered for children who are receiving mainte nance chemotherapy (weak, low). However, vaccines admin istered during cancer chemotherapy should *not* be

considered valid doses (strong, low) unless there is docu mentation of a protective antibody level (strong, moderate).

- 72. Live viral vaccines should *not* be administered during chemotherapy (strong, very low to moderate).
- 73. Three months after cancer chemotherapy, patients should be vaccinated with inactivated vaccines (strong, very low to moderate) and the live vaccines for varicella (weak, very low); measles, mumps, and rubella (strong, low); and measles, mumps, and rubella varicella (weak, very low) ac cording to the CDC annual schedule that is routinely indicated for immunocompetent persons. In regimens that included anti B cell antibodies, vaccinations should be delayed at least 6 months (strong, moderate).

Evidence Summary

Therapy for cancer has become increasingly intensive and has included immunosuppressive monoclonal antibodies. Since many vaccination studies were conducted during an era in which weaker immunosuppressive therapies were used, the results of such studies might not accurately represent the current risks and benefits of vaccinations in oncology patients today.

Inactivated vaccines in children. Children with cancer can safely receive inactivated vaccines. In general, the vaccines should not be administered during induction or consolidation therapy because of poor response rates during these periods [264]. While vaccines administered during less intensive phases of chemotherapy are less immunogenic compared with those administered off chemotherapy [265], they are not harmful and appear to provide seroprotection for some patho gens for some patients [266 269]. Many children have protec tive serum antibodies against certain vaccine preventable diseases ≥6 months after cessation of chemotherapy [270]. The routine childhood vaccination schedule should be reinitiated 3 months after completion of chemotherapy, when cellular and humoral immunity has recovered [271 274]. Routine revacci nation with a single dose of each vaccine antigen can be consid ered [270, 275], but it is uncertain if this is necessary. Another management plan that can be considered for patients who have received intense chemotherapy is serologic testing for vaccine preventable diseases with a recognized serologic correlate of protection (eg, diphtheria toxoid, Hib, HepA, HepB, IPV, rubella, influenza, measles, tetanus toxoid, varicella vaccines) and vaccination of those with inadequate serum antibody con centrations.

Influenza vaccine. Influenza vaccination with IIV is recommended for immunocompromised patients [41, 276]. Patients with colorectal cancer who received influenza vaccine had fewer chemotherapy interruptions and higher 1 year survival rates [277]. Study results in patients with hematological malignancies have been variable and are probably related to the type of malignancy and treatment received. In patients with multiple

myeloma, the immune response to 1 dose of vaccine was only 19% [278]. Similar results have been seen in patients with lym phoma [279 281], although a more recent study showed a higher seroprotection [282]. A 2 dose schedule is a possible strategy but was not more immunogenic in some studies [308] and has not been recommended by ACIP. Adults with lympho ma who received a 2 dose schedule showed responses of ap proximately 30% after 1 dose and approximately 45% after 2 doses of vaccine [337]. Two doses of pandemic 2009 A (H1N1) vaccine in patients with chronic myeloid leukemia and B cell malignancies resulted in a higher seroconversion than 1 dose; however, seroconversion was still lower than after a single dose in immunocompetent controls [328]. No patient who received maintenance rituximab responded to vaccination. Similarly, none of 67 lymphoma patients responded to adjuvanted 2009 A (HINI) vaccine within the first 6 months after rituximab therapy [284]. The response to IIV was impaired in lymphoma patients who completed a rituximab containing regimen ≥6 months earlier [285].

Patients receiving intensive chemotherapy are likely to be less responsive to influenza vaccination; however, the seasonal nature of influenza may warrant timely administration of IIV to induce immunity. The effectiveness is likely to be low in those at highest risk for severe disease. Most influenza virus infections in acute leukemia patients undergoing chemotherapy were no socomially acquired; therefore, influenza vaccination of family members and hospital staff should be strongly encouraged or required [286].

Data on IIV efficacy in adult patients with solid tumors are limited. In lung cancer patients, the vaccination response was similar to that seen in immunocompetent controls [287]. Similarly, the humoral response was adequate in a group of women with breast cancer [288, 289]. In a study of patients with various solid tumors, the response to vaccination was better than in patients with lymphoma [290]. Breast cancer patients with ongoing chemotherapy had poorer responses [291]. Influenza vaccination was cost effective in working age patients with cancer [292].

Pneumococcal vaccine. Antibody responses to PPSV23 are often impaired in patients with hematological malignancies, in cluding patients with multiple myeloma [278] or treated Hodgkin lymphoma [293, 294]. In contrast, a good response can be obtained before antitumor therapy is initiated [295, 296]. Antibody responses can be elicited in splenectomized patients with non Hodgkin and Hodgkin lymphomas [297]. Repeated vaccinations with PPSV23, before and after splenectomy, induced repeated antibody responses and were not associated with serious adverse effects during administration of approximately 600 doses to 380 patients [298, 299]. A single dose of a PCV7 gave suboptimal responses in patients who had been treated for Hodgkin lymphoma [300] or chronic lymphocytic leukemia [301]. Priming with

PCV7 improved the response to the PPSV23 in patients with previously treated Hodgkin lymphoma, including splenectomized patients [302, 303]. No data regarding the safety or immunogenic ity of PCV13 in these patients are available [124, 204], but CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of PCV13 for immunocompromised persons [109, 124]. Patients with mixed solid tumors were reported to respond well to vaccination with PPSV23 [290].

Diphtheria tetanus pertussis vaccine. Hammarström et al showed that 41% of acute leukemia patients were not seropro tected against tetanus [304]. In contrast, Nordoy et al reported that treatment of low grade non Hodgkin lymphoma patients with radio immunotherapy did not influence immunity to tetanus [280]. Responses to DT vaccinations in adult patients with hematological malignancies have not been systematically studied. Six or more months after completing chemotherapy for leukemia, all of 59 children had protective antibody titers against tetanus and all responded to a single dose of booster vaccination [270].

HepB vaccine. Patients with hematological malignancies, particularly B cell lymphomas treated with anti CD20 mono clonal antibody therapy, are prone to reactivation of HepB in fection during therapy [305]. The response rate to HepB vaccination is poor in patients who were receiving therapy for hematological malignancies [306, 307]. Although there are no data, it may be reasonable to vaccinate unvaccinated patients with HepB vaccine either prior to or after discontinuation of therapy against their malignancy.

Preliminary data suggest that immune responses for patients who received monoclonal antibodies for lymphoma are poor for at least the first 6 months after completion of treatment [308]. A recent study suggests that responses to recall antigens are better than primary responses against antigens not previously encountered [309]. Patients who received autologous HSCT and thereafter rituximab responded well to vaccination with Hib and tetanus vaccines but not to PPSV23 given 6 and 9 months after the last rituximab infusion [310].

Contraindication to live viral vaccines. Live viral vaccines are contraindicated during chemotherapy because of the risk of disseminated disease. Administration after 3–6 months appears to be safe [266, 269]. Although VAR has been administered to children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia receiving mainte nance chemotherapy, it is generally not administered during these therapies [81, 83].

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELL TRANSPLANT PATIENTS

XVII. Should HSCT Donors and Patients Be Vaccinated Before Transplantation?

Recommendations (Table 4)

- 74. The HSCT donor should be current with routinely rec ommended vaccines based on age, vaccination history, and exposure history according to the CDC annual schedule (strong, high). However, administration of MMR, MMRV, VAR, and ZOS vaccines should be avoided within 4 weeks of stem cell harvest (weak, very low). Vaccination of the donor for the benefit of the recipient is *not* recommended (weak, moderate).
- 75. Prior to HSCT, candidates should receive vaccines indicated for immunocompetent persons based on age, vaccination history, and exposure history according to the CDC annual schedule if they are not already immunosuppressed (strong, very low to moderate) and when the interval to start of the conditioning regimen is ≥4 weeks for live vaccines (strong, low) and 2 weeks for inactivated vaccines (strong, moderate).
- 76. Nonimmune HSCT candidates aged ≥ 12 months should receive VAR (as a 2 dose regimen if there is sufficient time) if they are not immunosuppressed and when the interval to start the conditioning regimen is ≥ 4 weeks (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

Donor immunity can be transferred to the HSCT recipient [311 318], and vaccination of the donor has been shown to improve posttransplant immunity [315, 319 321]. However, there are logistical problems to vaccinating donors and ethical considerations if a vaccine is administered solely for the benefit of the HSCT recipient. Only vaccines that are indicated and rec ommended based on the donor's age, vaccination history, and exposure history should be administered. It is not known if vaccination of donors with MMR, MMRV, VAR, or ZOS vaccines within 4 weeks of stem cell harvesting causes safety issues for the HSCT recipient.

In most HSCT patients, antigen specific antibody titers pro gressively decrease with time after HSCT, and patients may become susceptible to infections such as tetanus [314, 322], po liovirus [323–325], and measles [326, 327]. The clinical rele vance of decreased antibodies to vaccine preventable diseases among recipients is difficult to assess because, with the exception of infections caused by pneumococci and influenza, a limited number of cases of vaccine preventable diseases have been reported among HSCT recipients [328]. In general, post HSCT patients should be viewed as "never vaccinated" patients regardless of the pre HSCT vaccination history of the patient or the donor.

The guidelines for vaccination of HSCT candidates and recipients have been adapted from the Guidelines for Preventing Infectious Complications among Hematopoietic Cell Transplant Recipients: A Global Perspective that was prepared in collaboration with several international organizations [15]. Based

on available data, there are no differences in recommendations for autologous and allogeneic HSCT patients.

It has been shown that existing recipient immunity frequent ly is retained for several months after HSCT [316, 326]. Patients respond poorly to vaccination early after HSCT. By vaccinating the seronegative patient before HSCT, it is likely that some protection will persist. No data exist regarding the interval needed between varicella vaccination and start of conditioning; however, a 4 week interval is likely to be safe. In patients with cancer who are undergoing chemotherapy and in children with acute leukemia that is in remission, a rash has been noted up to 60 days after vaccination [329, 330]. The strategy of pretrans plant vaccination of seronegative patients has not been tested in a clinical study. However, this strategy is likely to be safe because children with acute leukemia who received VAR subsequently underwent allogeneic HSCT without developing clinical manifestations of varicella [331].

XVIII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Adults and Children After HSCT?

Recommendations (Table 4)

- 77. One dose of IIV should be administered annually (strong, moderate) to persons aged ≥6 months starting 6 months after HSCT (strong, moderate) and starting 4 months after if there is a community outbreak of influenza as defined by the local health department (strong, very low). For children aged 6 months 8 years who are receiving influenza vaccine for the first time, 2 doses should be administered (strong, low).
- 78. Three doses of PCV13 should be administered to adults and children starting at age 3 6 months after HSCT (strong, low). At 12 months after HSCT, 1 dose of PPSV23 should be given provided the patient does not have chronic GVHD (strong, low). For patients with chronic GVHD, a fourth dose of PCV13 can be given at 12 months after HSCT (weak, very low).*
- 79. Three doses of Hib vaccine should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT (strong, moderate).
- 80. Two doses of MCV4 should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT to persons aged 11 18 years, with a booster dose given at age 16 18 years for those who received the initial post HSCT dose of vaccine at age 11 15 years (strong, low).
- 81. Three doses of tetanus/diphtheria containing vaccine should be administered 6 months after HSCT (strong, low). For children aged <7 years, 3 doses of DTaP should be administered (strong, low). For patients aged ≥7 years, admin istration of 3 doses of DTaP should be considered (weak, very low).* Alternatively, a dose of Tdap vaccine should be administered followed by either 2 doses of DT vaccine (weak, moderate)* or 2 doses of Td vaccine (weak, low).

- 82. Three doses of HepB vaccine should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT (strong, moderate). If a postvaccina tion anti HBs concentration of ≥10 mIU/mL is not attained, a second 3 dose series of HepB vaccine (strong, low; alterna tive: 1 dose of HepB vaccine after which anti HBs is tested*), using standard dose (strong, moderate) or high dose (40 µg*; weak, low) for children and high dose for adolescents* and adults (strong, low), should be administered.
- 83. Three doses of IPV vaccine should be administered 6 12 months after HSCT (strong, moderate).
- 84. Consider administration of 3 doses of HPV vaccine 6 12 months after HSCT for female patients aged 11 26 years and HPV4 vaccine for males aged 11 26 years (weak, very low).
- 85. Do *not* administer live vaccines to HSCT patients with active GVHD or ongoing immunosuppression (strong, low).
- 86. A 2 dose series of MMR vaccine should be administered to measles seronegative adolescents and adults (strong, low) and to measles seronegative children (strong, moderate) 24 months after HSCT in patients with neither chronic GVHD nor ongoing immunosuppression and 8 11 months (or earlier if there is a measles outbreak) after the last dose of immune globulin intravenous (IGIV).
- 87. A 2 dose series of VAR should be administered 24 months after HSCT to varicella seronegative patients with neither GVHD nor ongoing immunosuppression and 8 11 months after the last dose of IGIV (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

Influenza vaccine. Influenza, which is often a severe illness after HSCT, is associated with mortality of 10% 15% in individuals not treated with antiviral medication [332]. Patients infected with the 2009 pandemic influenza A (H1N1) virus were at in creased risk for pneumonia and for mechanical ventilation and had significant mortality despite oseltamivir therapy [333, 334]. Fatal influenza illness can occur several years after HSCT [332]. Lifelong annual vaccination with IIV is therefore recommended for all HSCT recipients. The time when vaccination should be initiated after HSCT depends, in part, on anticipation of influ enza in the patient's community but is more likely to be effec tive when the time interval after HSCT is longer, preferably ≥6 months [335 337]. Even in cases where there is no serological response, T cell responses that prevent serious disease may be elicited [338, 339]. During community outbreaks, HSCT recipi ents should be vaccinated against influenza immediately if it is >4 months after HSCT. Children aged <9 years who are receiv ing influenza vaccine for the first time require 2 doses adminis tered ≥4 weeks apart. For IIV, data regarding the effectiveness of a second dose in older children and adults are conflicting. However, studies showed improved response rates to vaccines against 2009 pandemic A (H1N1) [335, 337, 340]. LAIV should

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 36 of 57

not be used because the safety and efficacy of this vaccine in HSCT patients are unknown and an IIV alternative exists.

Pneumococcal vaccine. HSCT recipients are at a significantly higher risk for invasive pneumococcal infection than the general population [341 344]. However, PPSV23 is usually in effective when given during the first year after transplantation, particularly in patients with chronic GVHD [345 349]. In 3 prospective trials, PCV7 given after HSCT was more immuno genic than historical controls given PPSV23 [350 352]. In a comparative trial of PCV7 and PPSV23 in adult HSCT recipi ents, PCV7 given to donors and recipients was more immuno genic than PPSV23 given to donors and recipients [353]. In 1 of these trials there were similar and substantial antibody re sponses to vaccination with a 3 dose PCV7 series whether started at 3 months (early) or 9 months (late) posttransplant [350]. Thus, early vaccination may be preferred. However, early vaccination may result in a shorter duration of protective con centrations of antibody, and a fourth booster dose may be indi cated if vaccination is given early after HSCT [350]. It is likely beneficial to administer PPSV23 for the fourth dose of vaccine starting 12 months after HSCT to provide immunity to addi tional serotypes [350, 354]. However, a fourth dose of PCV13 might be preferable in patients with chronic GVHD who are unlikely to respond to PPSV23 [346, 349, 355]. CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of PCV13 for immunocompromised persons [109, 124].

Hib conjugate vaccine. Vaccination with Hib can elicit pro tective immune responses after allogeneic HSCT [347, 348, 356]. The timing after HSCT is important since the immune re sponse to Hib vaccine early after HSCT, that is, <6 months, re sulted in poor responses in children who received transplants [357].

Diphtheria tetanus pertussis vaccine. There are 2 categories of diphtheria and tetanus vaccines: those containing a "full" dose of diphtheria toxoid in combination with tetanus toxoid (DT) and those containing a reduced quantity of diphtheria toxoid (Td). In the United States, DT vaccine is not approved for persons aged >6 years due to adverse effects. However, ex perience with adult HSCT recipients indicates a lower risk for adverse effects than in previously vaccinated immunocompetent adults [358], suggesting that the adverse effect profile of DT vaccine may be acceptable in this population. It has not yet been determined whether the immune response to Td is equivalent to the response to DT vaccine.

HSCT recipients may be vulnerable to complications from pertussis, although there are very limited published data [359, 360]. For immunocompetent individuals, acellular pertussis vaccine that is administered as DTaP is recommended in young children, and a single booster dose of a vaccine containing Tdap is recommended in children starting at age 10 years and for adolescents and adults (to replace a dose of adult Td

booster). Ideally, posttransplant patients are viewed as "never vaccinated" and, consequently, they should receive full doses of toxoids, DT, and DTaP. However, DTaP is indicated only for children aged <7 years. Tdap is less likely than DTaP vaccine to cause local side effects in immunocompetent adults. Prelimi nary data in autologous HSCT recipients [361, 362] show that the response to pertussis (and tetanus) antigens in Tdap is poor, irrespective of the timing of vaccination post HSCT [361], suggesting that this vaccine should be used as a booster rather than as part of the primary series. A 3 dose series of a vaccine with high tetanus and pertussis content, that is, DTaP, may be more immunogenic in HSCT recipients and thus should be considered for the initial vaccination regardless of patient age.

HepB vaccine. There are limited data regarding the efficacy of HepB vaccination in HSCT recipients. In a study of autolo gous HSCT recipients, 69% seroconverted after a vaccine series [363]. Similarly, in a study of allogeneic HSCT recipients, 64% seroconverted; this rate was lower than that in age matched controls [364]. Thus, a determination of postvaccine anti HBs concentration is indicated in order to determine if additional doses of vaccine are needed.

MMR vaccine. Most HSCT patients become seronegative to measles during an extended follow up [326, 327]. There have been reports of severe and fatal measles in HSCT recipients [365, 366]. Administration of MMR vaccine can be considered 2 years after transplantation in allogeneic HSCT patients without chronic GVHD or ongoing immunosuppression. In Brazil, 34 patients who were not receiving immunosuppressive drugs were safely vaccinated 1 2 years after HSCT [367]. Since adults who experience natural measles infection prior to trans plantation usually retain immunity for several years after HSCT, it is recommended that a measles serology be per formed, with vaccination of only seronegative patients. The re sponses to measles vaccine varied, with a higher response rate observed in adults than in children [367 370]. In order to achieve protective and long lasting immunity, a second dose is recommended for children who have undergone HSCT. Rubella vaccination is indicated in women with the potential to become pregnant. The presence of measles antibodies from IGIV or other blood products may interfere with the response to measles vaccine and possibly certain other live vaccines, for example, varicella. Therefore, it is appropriate to delay adminis tration of these vaccines for 8 months (after an IGIV dose of 400 mg/kg body mass) or 11 months (after an IGIV dose of 2 gm/kg body mass). However, if risk of exposure to measles is high, MMR vaccine can be given sooner, but the dose should be repeated after the interval noted above [223].

Varicella vaccine. VAR can be considered for seronegative HSCT recipients who meet the criteria for live virus vaccination delineated above for measles vaccine. One center required a

CD4 T lymphocyte count \geq 200 cell/mm³ and documentation of a response to \geq 1 other vaccine as prerequisites for VAR ad ministration [85, 87, 371]. ZOS should not be administered as there are no data on safety or effectiveness.

Other vaccines. There are no data regarding vaccination of HSCT recipients with HPV vaccines. The use of BCG vaccine is contraindicated because it is a live bacterial vaccine with a potential risk of serious adverse effects. The same is true for live rotavirus vaccines that are licensed by the US Food and Drug Administration only for young infants.

Patients with chronic GVHD can mount responses to protein based vaccines. The risk for exacerbation of GVHD is low based on experience in several hundred patients [325, 348, 350, 358]. However, vaccination with polysaccharide based vaccines is often ineffective, and PCV13 is preferred over PPSV23 in patients with GVHD [349, 355]. Although there are no data, it might be reasonable to delay vaccination of patients treated with high doses of corticosteroids or recent therapy with im munosuppressive monoclonal antibodies such as rituximab or alemtuzumab because the antibody response may be low. Live vaccines are not recommended because their safety is not assured given the immunosuppression of GVHD and its therapy.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF SOLID ORGAN TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS

XIX. For Adult and Child Solid Organ Transplant Candidates and Living Donors, Which Vaccines Should Be Administered During Pretransplant Evaluation?

Recommendations (Table 5)

- 88. Living donors should be current with vaccines based on age, vaccination history, and exposure history according to the CDC annual schedule (strong, high); MMR, MMRV, VAR, and ZOS vaccine administration should be avoided within 4 weeks of organ donation (weak, very low). Vaccina tion of donors solely for the recipient's benefit is generally not recommended (weak, low).
- 89. Adults and children with chronic or end stage kidney, liver, heart, or lung disease, including solid organ transplant (SOT) candidates, should receive all age, exposure history, and immune status appropriate vaccines based on the CDC annual schedule for immunocompetent persons (strong, moderate).
- 91. Adult SOT candidates; adults with end stage kidney disease; and pediatric patients who are SOT candidates; are aged <6 years and have end stage kidney, heart, or lung disease; or are aged 6 18 years and have end stage kidney disease should receive PCV13 as in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low).

- 92. Adults and children aged ≥2 years who are SOT candidates or have end stage kidney disease should receive PPSV23 if they have not received a dose within 5 years and have not received 2 lifetime doses (strong, moderate). Patients with end stage kidney disease should receive 2 lifetime doses 5 years apart (strong, low). Adults and children aged ≥2 years with end stage heart or lung disease as well as adults with chronic liver disease, including cirrhosis, should receive a dose of PPSV23 if they have never received a dose (strong, low). When both PCV13 and PPSV23 are indicated, PCV13 should be completed 8 weeks prior to PPSV23 (strong, moderate).
- Anti HBs negative SOT candidates should receive the HepB vaccine series (strong, moderate) and, if on hemodialysis and aged ≥20 years, they should receive the high dose (40 µg) HepB vaccine series (strong, moderate). If a postvaccina tion anti HBs concentration of ≥10 mIU/mL is not attained, a second 3 dose series of HepB vaccine (strong, low; alterna tive: 1 dose of HepB vaccine after which anti HBs is tested*) should be administered, using standard dose (strong, moder ate) or high dose* for children (weak, low) and high dose for adolescents* and adults (strong, low). HepA unvaccinated, undervaccinated, or seronegative SOT candidates (particu larly liver transplant candidates) aged 12 23 months (strong, moderate) and ≥2 years (strong, moderate) should receive a HepA vaccine series.
- 93. Combined HepA HepB vaccine can be used for SOT candidates aged ≥12 years of age* in whom both vaccines are indicated (strong, moderate).
- 94. The HPV vaccine series should be administered to SOT candidates aged 11 26 years (strong, low moderate).
- 95. SOT candidates aged 6 11 months can receive MMR vaccine if they are not receiving immunosuppression and if transplantation is not anticipated within 4 weeks (weak, very low). If transplantation is delayed (and the child is not re ceiving immunosuppression), the MMR vaccine should be repeated at 12 months (strong, moderate).
- 96. The VAR should be administered to SOT candidates without evidence of varicella immunity (as defined in recommendation 16) if they are not receiving immunosuppres sion and if transplantation is not anticipated within 4 weeks (strong, moderate). The VAR can be administered to varicel la naive SOT candidates aged 6–11 months who are not immunosuppressed provided the timing is ≥4 weeks prior to transplant (weak, very low).* Optimally, 2 doses should be administered ≥3 months apart (strong, low).
- 97. SOT candidates aged ≥60 years (strong, moderate) and varicella positive candidates (as defined in recommendation 22) aged 50 59 years (weak, low)* who are not severely im munocompromised should receive ZOS if transplantation is *not* anticipated within 4 weeks.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 38 of 57

Evidence Summary

SOT candidates should receive indicated vaccinations prior to transplantation, preferably early in their disease [372–374]. Live vaccines are generally not administered just prior to or post transplant. Vaccination guidelines for SOT candidates and recipients have been published [373, 374], including information on travel related vaccines [375] and the 2009 pandemic influen za A (H1N1) vaccine [376].

A standard vaccine series should be given to pediatric SOT candidates with the aim of completing the primary series and booster doses prior to transplantation [1, 377]. Vaccinated chil dren with chronic renal failure had serum antibodies against measles, mumps, rubella, varicella, HepB, *H. influenzae* type b, and *S. pneumoniae* in 1 study [378]. In another study [379], early MMR vaccination led to protective titers in 88% of infants with chronic renal failure. Practices for monitoring specific an tibody titers vary [380]. It may be reasonable to monitor titers to some vaccine preventable pathogens (eg, HepB) [381, 382]. However, except for annual monitoring of anti HBs titers in hemodialysis patients and kidney recipients, there is no consen sus on the interpretation of results or the implications for revaccination.

Because influenza can be severe in patients with end stage organ disease, annual vaccination with IIV is recommended for all transplantation candidates or recipients aged \geq 6 months [373, 376, 383].

Patients awaiting transplant are at increased risk for invasive pneumococcal disease. CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of PCV13 for immunocompromised persons, including those who have had a SOT [109, 124]. Protective titers can be attained after pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccination in most patients [384, 385], although these titers can wane within 2 years [386]. Because most adults have protective titers to Hib, pretransplant Hib vaccination of adults is unnecessary. In addition, adult patients who require splenectomy should receive MCV4.

Fewer than 50% of patients with chronic kidney disease have protective titers against tetanus [387]. Five years after Td booster vaccination of a cohort of hemodialysis patients, 71% had protective antibody levels to tetanus, but only 32% had protective titers to diphtheria [387]. Tdap vaccination has not been studied in this population.

HepB can be transmitted via HBsAg positive or HBsAg nega tive/anti HBc positive donors [388, 389], blood transfusions, and, rarely, nosocomial outbreaks. HepB vaccination is less effec tive in patients on hemodialysis than in patients at an earlier stage of renal disease [390, 391]. Hemodialysis guidelines [56] recommend high dose vaccine (ie, 40 μ g), testing anti HBs levels 1 to 2 months after the last dose of the vaccine series and also annually, as well as revaccination if anti HBs levels are <10 mIU/mL.

HepB vaccination is also less effective in patients with end stage liver disease [372, 392, 393]. Vaccination strategies include

enhanced potency vaccine, accelerated schedules (if transplant is imminent), and adjuvants [394, 395]. Seroconversion was better after repeated high dose (80 μ g) vaccine administration in nonresponders in 1 study [396]. Despite a report of immunity transfer from vaccinated living liver donors [397], HepB vaccination of these donors is not recommended.

Vaccination of SOT candidates with HepA vaccine is important because this vaccine can cause fulminant hepatitis in patients with underlying liver disease, particularly HepC. Patients with chronic liver disease respond to HepA vaccine, although at lower rates than do immunocompetent individuals [398, 399]. Vaccination before liver disease becomes advanced is likely to be more effective [400]. Combined HepA HepB vaccine is useful in pretransplant vaccination.

Transplant patients are at higher risk for HPV related genital warts, cervical cancer, and other anogenital malignancies. Data are awaited on efficacy of pretransplant vaccination in prevention of posttransplant HPV infection.

Live vaccines. The risk of posttransplant disease from pre transplant administration of live vaccines such as VAR, MMR, or ZOS vaccines has not been completely defined. A waiting period of 4 weeks was chosen based, in part, on the outer range of risk for developing skin lesions postvaccination for most patients. Many patients receive posttransplant chemoprophylaxis for herpes simplex and cytomegalovirus infections that is active against VZV, which helps prevent infection but also reduces vaccine efficacy. Most transplant centers will not administer live vaccines to candidates scheduled for transplant within 3 to 4 weeks; however, more data are needed to determine the optimal timing of vaccination.

Rotavirus vaccines should be administered to pretransplant infants starting at age 2 months (6 weeks is acceptable) with completion of the series by age 8 months. Although viral shed ding can occur for \geq 15 days after administration, it is unknown whether adverse consequences will result if transplantation occurs shortly after vaccination (Table 5).

VAR should be considered in SOT candidates because of disease severity after transplantation [71]. Fewer than 5% of adult renal transplant candidates were varicella seronegative [401]. Children with nephrotic syndrome in remission who were not significantly immunosuppressed were safely vaccinat ed [82], but long term efficacy remains unknown. VAR was safely administered to uremic children, including those await ing transplantation [17, 402 404], and to 11 adults awaiting renal transplantation [401]. Almost all pediatric vaccinees sero converted after 2 doses, and VZV antibody persisted in 75% 100% for ≥2 years after transplantation. The incidence of varicella in vaccinees was reduced by approximately 75% after transplantation compared with the incidence in unvaccinated renal transplant recipients; the severity of illness was generally milder in vaccinees who developed varicella. VAR was safe and

effective in 704 pediatric renal transplant candidates [17, 402], with 42% retaining VZV antibodies >10 years posttransplant [402]. Vaccinated patients had a lower risk for varicella post transplant, less severe disease, and less HZ than unvaccinated patients [402]. Pediatric liver transplantation candidates had a seroconversion rate of 95% in 1 study [16], but only 3 of 11 se roconverted in another study [405]. Varicella vaccination of 29 children with chronic liver disease who were not receiving im munosuppressive medication resulted in seroconversion, al though antibody levels were lower than in immunocompetent children [406]. Some authors recommend monitoring varicella titers and administering a third dose pretransplant if titers wane [407], However, commercially available assays exhibit poor sensitivity for detection of VAR induced antibodies.

ZOS should be administered to pretransplant candidates who meet ACIP defined criteria (aged ≥60 years and not se verely immunosuppressed) or are aged 50 59 years, are varicel la positive (defined in recommendation 22), and not severely immunocompromised if transplantation is not expected within 4 weeks [10]. This recommendation is based on posttransplant morbidity of zoster rather than evidence of ZOS efficacy in this setting.

XX. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to SOT Recipients?

Recommendations

- 98. Vaccination should be withheld from SOT recipients during intensified immunosuppression, including the first 2 month posttransplant period, because of the likelihood of inadequate response (strong, low). However, IIV can be ad ministered ≥1 month after transplant during a community influenza outbreak (weak, very low).
- 99. Standard age appropriate inactivated vaccine series should be administered 2 to 6 months after SOT based on the CDC annual schedule (strong, low to moderate), including IIV (strong, moderate; Table 5).
- 100. PCV13 should be administered 2 to 6 months after SOT if not administered before SOT, with the timing based on the patient's degree of immunosuppression, as described in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low to moderate; Table 5).
- 101. For SOT patients aged ≥2 years, 1 dose of PPSV23 should be administered 2 to 6 months after SOT, with the timing based on the patient's degree of immunosuppression, and ≥8 weeks after indicated doses of PCV13, if not given within 5 years and if the patient has received no more than 1 previous lifetime dose (strong, moderate).
- 102. HepB vaccine should be considered for chronic HepB infected recipients 2 to 6 months after liver transplant in an attempt to eliminate the lifelong requirement for HepB immune globulin (HBIG; weak, low).*

- 103. MMR vaccine and VAR should generally *not* be admin istered to SOT recipients because of insufficient safety and effectiveness data (strong, low), except for varicella in chil dren without evidence of immunity (as defined in recommendation 15) who are renal or liver transplant recipients, are receiving minimal or no immunosuppression, and have no recent graft rejection (weak, moderate).*
- 104. Vaccination should *not* be withheld because of concern about transplant organ rejection (strong, moderate).

Evidence Summary

The optimal time to begin vaccination after transplant is not defined, but many centers wait ≥2 months to avoid high doses of antirejection medications that would impede seroconversion. The degree of immunosuppression varies by patient, and some patients may not mount adequate vaccine responses at 2 months posttransplant. An exception may be administration of IIV 1 month after SOT during a community outbreak of influenza based on expert opinion [376].

Influenza can cause severe illness in SOT patients [276, 383]. Seroconversion has varied by vaccine and among transplant types [103, 104, 408 419]. Efficacy and effectiveness have varied by epidemic strain and between influenza A and B virus types and influenza A subtypes [103, 104], as well as by immunosup pressive regimen (eg, mycophenolate mofetil) or recent rejec tion [409, 416, 419, 420]. Some studies have noted increased responses with repeat doses of influenza vaccine [410]. Effec tiveness of influenza vaccine was demonstrated against influen za like illness in 29% and 33% of heart recipients who received 1 of 2 influenza vaccines compared with 63% of control unvac cinated heart transplant recipients [413]. In 2 studies, cellular immune responses to influenza vaccine were impaired [415, 421]. In a recent study of 51 730 adult renal transplant recipi ents, influenza vaccination in the first posttransplant year was associated with lower risks of allograft loss and death [422]. A recent randomized controlled trial of high dose intradermal (15 µg) vs standard dose intramuscular influenza vaccine in organ transplant recipients found no significant differences in response, suggesting that the intradermal vaccine may be an ac ceptable alternative [423].

ACIP recommends PCV13 for adults and children with a SOT and PPSV23 for adults and children aged ≥2 years with a SOT [109, 124]. Pneumococcal vaccination with PPSV23 is associated with seroconversion rates as high as 94% in some, but not all, studies [411, 424 427]. In adult renal transplant patients, anti body levels and persistence after PCV7 were not superior com pared with the levels and persistence in those receiving PPSV23 [427, 428]. Adult liver recipients did not have an enhanced re sponse to PPSV23 after a prior dose of PCV7 ("prime boost" strategy), and the authors concluded that 1 PPSV23 dose remains the standard for posttransplant recipients [429].

Two doses of PCV7 raised serotype specific antibody after the first dose of PCV7 in pediatric SOT recipients, although at lower titers than in controls; antibody levels did not rise further after the second PCV7 dose or when a subsequent dose of PPSV23 was administered [430]. Barton et al studied the ad ministration of 3 doses of PCV7 followed by PPSV23 in pediat ric SOT recipients [431]. Mean concentrations increased 2 fold in all organ groups after 2 doses of PCV7; however, heart and lung recipients appeared to benefit from the third PCV7 dose. PPSV23 resulted in significantly higher antibody titers to some PCV7 serotypes [431]. Booster vaccination with Td produced good responses in pediatric renal transplant recipients [432].

HepB vaccination in pediatric liver recipients showed a 70% seroconversion rate, with another 50% of nonresponders converting after additional booster and double doses [433]. Responses were superior in children receiving monotherapy rather than combination therapy for immunosuppression [433]. To eliminate the requirement for long term therapy with costly HBIG after liver transplantation for HepB, some centers have vaccinated these recipients. However, seroconversions occurred in a small proportion of patients using standard or high dose HepB vaccine [434, 435]. Some anti HBs positive liver recipients transplanted for diseases other than HepB infection lost their protective titers posttransplant [394].

Some liver recipients who were seropositive for HepA pre transplant became seronegative posttransplant [436]. Vaccina tion with a 2 dose HepA vaccine series was well tolerated in 37 liver transplant recipients, but only 26% of the recipients were seropositive at 7 months postvaccination [399]. In another study, satisfactory seroconversion rates in renal and liver recipients were followed by a rapid decline in HepA antibody titers [437].

There are no published data on the immunogenicity of HPV vaccine in SOT recipients. SOT recipients have significant mor bidity from HPV warts [438]; therefore, HPV4 vaccine is pre ferred over HPV2 vaccine in this population.

Varicella related safety after transplant was shown in a small series of pediatric liver, renal, and intestine transplant recipients [16–18, 439]. In contrast, significant disease was reported after inadvertent administration of VAR to transplant recipients [74, 440]. In a recent report of vaccination of 36 pediatric liver recipients with VAR in which the vaccine was administered a median of 3.0 years posttransplant, vaccination was found to be safe and seroprotective [441]. No data exist on the safety of ro tavirus vaccine posttransplant.

Case reports and small series have raised the question of whether vaccines trigger allograft rejection [417]; virtually all larger studies found no excess rejection or clinically significant allograft dysfunction after vaccinations [408, 409, 411–413, 418, 442–444, 407]. One study of 3601 heart transplant recipients at multiple centers found no vaccine related differences in the

incidence or seasonality of rejection [444, 407]. Kimball et al found that influenza vaccination did not lead to anti HLA allo antibodies nor increased frequency of rejection in heart recipients [443]. A recent study involving 17 kidney and lung transplant recipients demonstrated augmentation of cellular al loimmunity after influenza vaccination. However, the clinical implications are unclear [445]. A study of >50 000 adult renal transplant recipients showed no deleterious effect with vaccina tion. Importantly, influenza vaccination during the first year after transplantation was associated with decreased risks of al lograft loss and death [422].

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC INFLAMMATORY DISEASES ON IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE MEDICATIONS

Patients with chronic inflammatory diseases (including immune mediated and autoimmune diseases) are often treated with immunosuppressive drugs, as single agents or in combination, for long periods of time. Initiation of immunosuppression should *not* be delayed to facilitate vaccination if immediate treatment is needed.

XXI. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Patients With Chronic Inflammatory Diseases Maintained on Immuno suppressive Therapies?

Recommendation (Table 6)

- 105. Inactivated vaccines, including IIV, should be adminis tered to patients with chronic inflammatory illness treated (strong, low moderate) or about to be treated (strong, moderate) with immunosuppressive agents as for immunocom petent persons based on the CDC annual schedule.
- 106. PCV13 should be administered to adults and children with a chronic inflammatory illness that is being treated with immunosuppression as described in the standard schedule for children and in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low moderate; Table 6).
- 107. PPSV23 should be administered to patients aged ≥2 years with chronic inflammatory illnesses with planned initia tion of immunosuppression (strong, low), low level immuno suppression (strong, low), and high level immunosuppression (strong, very low). Patients should receive PPSV23 ≥8 weeks after PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be given 5 years later (strong, low).
- 108. VAR should be administered to patients with chronic inflammatory diseases without evidence of varicella immunity (defined in recommendation 15; strong, moderate) ≥ 4 weeks prior to initiation of immunosuppression (strong, low) if treatment initiation can be safely delayed.

109. VAR should be considered for patients without evi dence of varicella immunity (defined in recommendation 15) being treated for chronic inflammatory diseases with long term, low level immunosuppression (weak, very low).* 110. ZOS should be administered to patients with chronic in flammatory disorders who are aged ≥60 years prior to initia tion of immunosuppression (strong, low) or being treated with low dose immunosuppression (strong, very low) and those who are aged 50 59 years and varicella positive prior to initiation of immunosuppression (weak, low)* or being treated with low dose immunosuppression (weak, very low).* 111. Other live vaccines should *not* be administered to pa tients with chronic inflammatory diseases on maintenance immunosuppression: LAIV (weak, very low), MMR vaccine in patients receiving low level (weak, very low) and high level immunosuppression (weak, very low); and MMRV vaccine in patients receiving low level (weak, very low) and high level immunosuppression (strong, very low).

112. Other recommended vaccines, including IIV and HepB vaccine, should *not* be withheld because of concerns about exacerbation of chronic immune mediated or inflammatory illness (strong, moderate).

Evidence Summary

Findings from 2 prospective trials of IIV in children with IBD [446, 447] suggest that IIV is safe and effective, although immu nogenicity may be decreased in patients treated with TNF α antibodies. In both studies, children receiving 6 mercaptopu rine or azathioprine had seroprotection rates comparable to those of immunocompetent controls and nonimmunosup pressed IBD patients for all 3 strains in the vaccine. Children treated with TNF α antibodies, however, had normal seroprotection rates to both type A vaccine strains but lower seroprotection and seroconversion rates to the type B vaccine strain. Vaccination was not associated with disease exacerbation. In 1 study, the overall coverage with inactivated vaccines, including IIV, in patients with IBD was low, indicating the need for more outreach and education for patients and medical providers [4].

Uncontrolled studies of patients with rheumatic inflammatory chronic illnesses receiving disease modifying drugs suggest ed an adequate immune response to IIV. In children with rheumatologic conditions receiving disease modifying antirheumatic drugs, seroprotection rates to influenza vaccine ranged from 80% to 98% [448]. In adults with RA or SLE, IIV was safe and induced protective antibody concentrations in most patients. However, immunogenicity was reduced in patients receiving azathioprine, infliximab, or rituximab in some studies [100, 101, 449–452]. In addition, antibody response to vaccine was reduced in patients with RA who received rituximab compared to the response in immunocompetent persons or RA patients receiving MTX [453]. Immunogenicity to

inactivated H1N1 influenza vaccine was reduced in patients with rheumatic diseases on various immunosuppressive regimens compared with immunogenicity in immunocompetent controls. Patients receiving tocilizumab, an anti interleukin 6 receptor antibody, for treatment of RA or juvenile idiopathic arthritis had antibody responses to IIV that were similar to those of the comparator groups [454, 455]. Patients tolerated IIV without serious adverse effects or disease flare [456, 458].

There are few studies of inactivated vaccines other than IIV in chronic inflammatory disease populations treated with im munosuppression. In adults, responses to PPSV23 were similar among patients with RA treated with TNF α blockers and im munocompetent controls [459]. However, patients with RA and psoriatic arthritis treated with MTX had reduced responses regardless of anti TNF α treatment [459 461], and patients re ceiving rituximab had reduced responses [462]. RA patients treated with rituximab and MTX had decreased antibody re sponse to PPSV23 compared with RA patients on MTX alone; however, both groups had similar responses to tetanus toxoid [462]. Antibody response to PPSV23 in 190 adults with RA was not adversely affected by treatment with tocilizumab [463]. An tibody response to some PCV7 serotypes was decreased in 31 pediatric patients with juvenile rheumatic diseases on anti TNF α therapy compared with the response in immunocompe tent controls [464]. CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of PCV13 for immunocompromised persons including those re ceiving immunosuppressive medications [109, 124]. Immune responses to MCV4 were good irrespective of degree of immu nosuppression in 234 children and young adults with juvenile idiopathic arthritis in a multicenter open label study [465]. HepB vaccine was safe and induced an immune response in most of 44 RA patients in a prospective study [466].

Protection against varicella is important because of the potential severity of varicella infection. Unfortunately, published data on varicella vaccination in this population are limited [93] (see Varicella section).

Although no studies have been published on zoster vaccination in patients receiving immunosuppression, ACIP has concluded that vaccination is safe in adults receiving ≤20 mg per day of prednisone or other low level immunosuppression [10]. An expert panel of the American College of Rheumatology en dorsed these recommendations [467] and stated "until more research becomes available it may be advisable to avoid zoster in patients actively receiving TNFα inhibitors." Zoster vaccination could be considered prior to initiation of immunosuppression for patients aged 13–49 years with a chronic immune mediated or inflammatory disorder who have a history of varicella or who are seropositive despite no previous varicella vaccination; however, safety and effectiveness data are lacking. MMR revaccination of patients with juvenile idiopathic arthritis resulted in a good immune response to all 3 viruses without serious

adverse effects despite continued therapy with MTX or recent therapy with etanercept or anakinra [468, 469]. However, data are lacking on the safety of primary MMR vaccination and vaccination with other live vaccines in this population.

Exacerbations of autoimmune disease temporally related to influenza vaccination have been reported, yet prospective con trolled trials do not support a cause and effect relationship (see "Safety of Vaccination of Immunocompromised Patients"). Specifically, influenza vaccination did not increase disease ac tivity in patients with SLE or RA [100, 101, 451, 453, 470 472]. HepB vaccination had no effect on disease activity in patients with SLE or RA [466, 473]. Similarly, pneumococcal vaccina tion was not associated with worsening of clinical disease activity or laboratory measures of disease activity in patients with RA or SLE [474]. MMR vaccination did not affect disease activity in patients with juvenile idiopathic arthritis [469]. An in crease in disease relapses was observed in 7 patients with multiple sclerosis vaccinated with yellow fever vaccine [69].

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH ASPLENIA OR SICKLE CELL DISEASES

XXII. Which Vaccines Should Be Administered to Asplenic Patients and Those With Sickle Cell Diseases?

Recommendations (Table 7)

- 113. Asplenic patients and those with sickle cell diseases should receive vaccines including PCV13 for children aged <2 years, as recommended routinely for immunocompetent persons based on the CDC annual schedule. No vaccine is con traindicated (strong, moderate) except LAIV (weak, very low).
- 114. PCV13 should be administered to asplenic patients and patients with sickle cell diseases aged ≥ 2 years based on the CDC annual schedule for children and in recommendations 27a c (strong, very low moderate).
- 115. PPSV23 should be administered to asplenic patients and patients with a sickle cell disease aged ≥ 2 years (strong, low) with an interval of ≥ 8 weeks after PCV13, and a second dose of PPSV23 should be administered 5 years later (strong, low).
- 116. For PPSV23 naive patients aged ≥2 years for whom a splenectomy is planned, PPSV23 should be administered ≥2 weeks prior to surgery (and following indicated dose(s) of PCV13; strong, moderate) or ≥2 weeks following surgery (weak, low).*
- 117. One dose of Hib vaccine should be administered to un vaccinated persons aged ≥5 years who are asplenic or have a sickle cell disease (weak, low).
- 118. Meningococcal vaccine should be administered to patients aged ≥2 months who are asplenic or have a sickle cell disease (strong, low), as in recommendation 29. However,

MCV4 D should not be administered in patients aged <2 years because of a reduced antibody response to some pneu mococcal serotypes when both MCV4 and PCV are adminis tered simultaneously (strong, low). Revaccination with MCV4 (or MPSV4 for those aged >55 years who have not received MCV4) is recommended every 5 years (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

The rate of invasive pneumococcal disease caused by vaccine se rotypes in children aged <5 years with sickle cell diseases fell by 93% after implementation of vaccination with PCV7 [12]; however, some of this reduction may have been due to herd type immunity. In children aged >2 years with sickle cell disease who were given 2 doses of PCV7 followed by a single dose of PPSV23, antibody levels to all serotypes in PCV7 were greater than in children given PPSV23 alone [475]. CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of PCV13 for asplenic patients [109, 124].

The optimal timing of PPSV23 vaccination is ≥ 2 weeks prior to splenectomy. If vaccination cannot be completed by this time, it should be performed ≥ 2 weeks following splenectomy because this timing results in higher antibody concentrations or opsono phagocytic titers compared with vaccination at a shorter interval before or after surgery [476–478]. There are no similar data on the effect of timing of Hib, MCV4, or MPSV4 vaccination on se rologic responses in patients undergoing splenectomy.

A study in children aged <5 years with sickle cell disease vacci nated with Hib vaccine demonstrated a safety and immunoge nicity profile that was similar to that of controls [479]. In a study of 23 patients aged 9 23 years who were splenectomized for Hodgkin disease, antibody response was less than in the control group, but most patients responded to vaccination [480].

A lower antibody response to certain PCV13 serotypes was observed when infants were simultaneously vaccinated with PCV13 and MCV4 D. Therefore, MCV4 D should be adminis tered \geq 4 weeks after PCV13 [481, 482]. This was not observed when infants were simultaneously vaccinated with PCV7 and Hib MenCY [117].

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR VACCINATION OF PATIENTS WITH ANATOMIC BARRIER DEFECTS AT RISK FOR INFECTIONS WITH VACCINE-PREVENTABLE PATHOGENS

XXIII. Which Vaccinations Should Be Given to Individuals With Cochlear Implants or Congenital Dysplasias of the Inner Ear or Persistent CSF Communication With the Oropharynx or Nasopharynx?

Recommendations (Table 7)

119. Adults and children with profound deafness scheduled to receive a cochlear implant, congenital dysplasias of the

inner ear, or persistent cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) communication with the oropharynx or nasopharynx should receive all vaccines recommended routinely for immunocompetent persons based on the CDC annual schedule. No vaccine is contraindicated (strong, moderate; Table 7).

- 120. Patients with a cochlear implant, profound deafness and scheduled to receive a cochlear implant, or persistent commu nications between the CSF and oropharynx or nasopharynx should receive PCV13 as described in the standard schedule for children and recommendations 27a c (strong, low moderate).
- 121. Patients aged ≥24 months with a cochlear implant, profound deafness and scheduled to receive a cochlear implant, or persistent communications between the CSF and oropharynx or nasopharynx should receive PPSV23, prefera bly ≥8 weeks after receipt of PCV13 (strong, moderate).
- 122. PCV13 and PPSV23 should be administered ≥2 weeks prior to cochlear implant surgery, if feasible (strong, low).

Evidence Summary

The AAP policy statement includes recommendations for pneumococcal, Hib, and influenza vaccinations for children with cochlear implants [483]. CDC guidelines stress the impor tance of vaccination against S. pneumoniae for these patients. CDC's ACIP recommends routine use of PCV13 for adults and children with a cochlear implant [109, 124]. PCV13 has re placed PCV7, and no data are available regarding immunoge nicity and safety of PCV13 in these patients. A second dose of PPSV23 can be considered for patients with a cochlear implant, profound deafness who are scheduled to receive a cochlear implant, or persistent CSF communication with the orophar ynx or nasopharynx 5 years after the initial dose, although this is not recommended by the ACIP or AAP. The immunogenici ty of PCV7 compared with PPSV23 was evaluated in a prospec tive study of 174 patients with cochlear implants [484]. For children aged 2 5 years, PCV7 was more immunogenic than PPSV23. A review of invasive pneumococcal disease in children aged 24 59 months at high risk of pneumococcal disease re vealed 31 cases. Four (13%) were caused by serotypes covered in PPSV23 but not in PCV13, indicating the importance of PPSV23 in this patient population; however, 44% were caused by serotypes not covered by either vaccine [124].

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE IN VACCINATION OF IMMUNOCOMPROMISED PATIENTS

Listed below are areas that warrant future investigation.

General

a) Understanding the basic aspects of vaccines in various categories of immunocompromised patients, including the

- epidemiology of vaccine preventable infections, mediators of vaccine protection and adverse effects of vaccines, and effects of vaccines that contain new adjuvants on vaccine protection and adverse effects of vaccines.
- b) Establishment of a registry of immunocompromised vaccine recipients, particularly those receiving live vaccines, to provide additional safety data.
- c) Uptake of IIV and other vaccines offered by subspecialists compared with primary care providers and other strategies to increase vaccine uptake in immunocompromised patients.
- d) Transmission of LAIV and rotavirus vaccine to immuno compromised patients.
- e) Efficacy and safety of zoster vaccination in:
 - 1. Patients aged \geq 60 years and <60 years with planned immunosuppression that increases the risk for zoster,
 - 2. Patients receiving low level immunosuppression,
 - 3. Patients with HIV infection,
 - 4. Patients with chronic inflammatory disorders who are receiving severe immunosuppression (eg, tocilizumab anti IL 6 receptor antibody) or cyclophosphamide,
 - 5. Immunocompromised populations whose varicella immunity was induced by varicella rather than infection from wild type virus, and
 - 6. Efficacy of pretransplant zoster vaccination in order to prevent posttransplant zoster in SOT candidates.

HIV

- f) Optimal time to initiate vaccination after starting cART for HIV infection.
- g) HepB vaccination of HIV infected persons who are anti HBs negative but anti HBc positive (eg, no vaccination or 3 dose series or single dose followed by anti HBs testing 2 weeks later)
- h) Indications for and effect of revaccination of patients vaccinated prior to initiating cART.

Malignancy

i) Safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy of vaccines in patients with malignancy treated with contemporary regimens (eg, im munogenicity and safety of acellular pertussis vaccines with low [ap] or high [aP] antigen content); safety, immunogenicity, and effectiveness of IIV including vaccines with adjuvants during intensive chemotherapy and initial months afterward; need for a routine booster dose after completing chemotherapy; optimal timing of inactivated and live vaccines after completing chemotherapy; and duration of impaired response to vaccines after regimens that include anti B cell antibodies).

HSCT/SOT

 j) Safety and immunogenicity of single and multiple doses of DTaP or Tdap following HSCT.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 44 of 57

- k) Safety and immunogenicity of PCV13 in SOT candidates and recipients.
- Administration of HepB vaccine to chronic hepatitis B infected liver recipients posttransplant to eliminate the life long requirement for HBIG, including optimal dose, number of doses, and role of adjuvants.
- m) Immunogenicity and safety of vaccines at various levels of immunosuppression, and efficacy of vaccines in prevent ing clinical disease in SOT patients.
- n) Optimal interval between live vaccination and transplanta tion, and optimal timing of vaccination after transplantation.

Inflammatory Diseases

- Efficacy and safety of varicella vaccination in patients with chronic inflammatory diseases being treated with thera pies that induce mild immunosuppression.
- p) Immunogenicity and safety of adjuvanted influenza vaccine in patients with chronic inflammatory diseases being treated with biologic agents such as anti TNF antibodies.

Notes

Acknowledgments. The Expert Panel expresses its gratitude to external reviewers Drs Mary Healy, Gregory Poland, and Jane Seward. The panel also thanks Vita Washington, Cindy Hamilton PharmD, ELS, and Genet Demisa shi for their continued support throughout the guideline development process. Financial support. The Infectious Diseases Society of America provided support for this guideline.

Potential conflicts of interest. The following list is a reflection of what has been reported to the IDSA. In order to provide thorough transparency, the IDSA requires full disclosure of all relationships, regardless of relevancy to the guideline topic. Evaluation of such relationships as potential conflicts of interest is determined by a review process that includes assessment by the SPGC chair, the SPGC liaison to the development panel, the Board of Direc tors liaison to the SPGC, and, if necessary, the Conflict of Interest Task Force of the board. This assessment of disclosed relationships for possible conflict of interest is based on the relative weight of the financial relationship (ie, monetary amount) and the relevance of the relationship (ie, the degree to which an association might reasonably be interpreted by an independent ob server as related to the topic or recommendation of consideration). The reader of these guidelines should be mindful of this when the list of disclo sures is reviewed. R. A. has served as a subinvestigator on clinical trials funded by ViroPharma, Roche, and the CDC. A. B. has served as a subinves tigator on clinical trials funded by Abbott, UCB, and Merck; served as a con sultant to Dyax, Cubist, and Nutricia; received speaking fees from Merck; and received a writing honorarium from Up To Date, Inc. E. G. D. has served as a consultant with GlaxoSmithKline and received a grant from Pfizer. I. K. has received research funding from Amino Up Chemical. H. K. has received funding from Pfizer for a clinical trial. M. L. has served as a consultant for Merck, MedImmune, and GlaxoSmithKline; has received honoraria and patent license from Merck; is on an adjudication committee for GlaxoS mithKline; and participates in research studies with Sanofi Pasteur, GlaxoS mithKline, and Merck. P. L. has served as a consultant to ViroPharma, Vical, Clinigen, Astellas Pharma, and Pfizer; served as an investigator for ViroPhar ma, Astellas Pharma, Pfizer, and Merck; and chaired a Data and Safety Moni toring Board for AiCuris. No conflicts: G. A., L. R., S. D., M. T., L. S., and E. W. All other authors report no potential conflicts.

All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have been disclosed.

References

- Burroughs M, Moscona A. Immunization of pediatric solid organ transplant candidates and recipients. Clin Infect Dis 2000; 30:857

 69.
- Davies K, Woo P. Immunization in rheumatic diseases of childhood: an audit of the clinical practice of British Paediatric Rheumatology Group members and a review of the evidence. Rheumatology (Oxford) 2002; 41:937
 41.
- Bridges MJ, Coady D, Kelly CA, Hamilton J, Heycock C. Factors influencing uptake of influenza vaccination in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Ann Rheum Dis 2003; 62:685.
- Melmed GY, Ippoliti AF, Papadakis KA, et al. Patients with inflamma tory bowel disease are at risk for vaccine preventable illnesses. Am J Gastroenterol 2006; 101:1834 40.
- Stratton K, Andrew F, Rusch E, Clayton E. Adverse effects of vaccines: evidence and causality. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2012.
- Field MJ, Lohr KN. Institute of Medicine committee to advise the Public Health Service on clinical practice guidelines (1990). Clinical practice guidelines: directions for a new program. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1990:52
- Guidelines for the Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in HIV Exposed and HIV Infected Children. http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines/html/5/pediatric oi prevention and treatment guidelines/0. Accessed 8 November 2013.
- 8. Kaplan JE, Benson C, Holmes KH, Brooks JT, Pau A, Masur H. Guidelines for prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV infected adults and adolescents: recommendations from CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. MMWR Recomm Rep 2009; 58:229 35.
- Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consen sus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. BMJ 2008; 336:924 6.
- Harpaz R, Ortega Sanchez IR, Seward JF. Prevention of herpes zoster: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep 2008; 57:1 30.; quiz CE2 4.
- No authors listed. General recommendations on immunization recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep 2011; 60:1 64.
- Halasa NB, Shankar SM, Talbot TR, et al. Incidence of invasive pneu mococcal disease among individuals with sickle cell disease before and after the introduction of the pneumococcal conjugate vaccine. Clin Infect Dis 2007; 44:1428 33.
- Atashili J, Kalilani L, Adimora AA. Efficacy and clinical effectiveness of influenza vaccines in HIV infected individuals: a meta analysis. BMC Infect Dis 2006; 6:138.
- 14. Heijstek MW, Ott de Bruin LM, Bijl M, et al. EULAR recommenda tions for vaccination in paediatric patients with rheumatic diseases. Ann Rheum Dis 2011, 70:1704 12.
- Tomblyn M, Chiller T, Einsele H, et al. Guidelines for preventing in fectious complications among hematopoietic cell transplantation re cipients: a global perspective. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2009; 15:1143 238.
- Kano H, Mizuta K, Sakakihara Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of immuni zation for pre and post liver transplant children. Transplantation 2002; 74:543 50.
- Zamora I, Simon JM, Da Silva ME, Piqueras AI. Attenuated varicella virus vaccine in children with renal transplants. Pediatr Nephrol 1994; 8:190

 2.
- Weinberg A, Horslen SP, Kaufman SS, et al. Safety and immunogenic ity of varicella zoster virus vaccine in pediatric liver and intestine transplant recipients. Am J Transplant 2006; 6:565
- Gershon AA, Steinberg SP, Gelb L, et al. Live attenuated varicella vaccine. Efficacy for children with leukemia in remission. JAMA 1984; 252:355 62.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 45 of 57

- Son M, Shapiro ED, LaRussa P, et al. Effectiveness of varicella vaccine in children infected with HIV. J Infect Dis 2010; 201:1806 10.
- Olin P, Hallander HO, Gustafsson L, Reizenstein E, Storsaeter J. How to make sense of pertussis immunogenicity data. Clin Infect Dis 2001; 33 (Suppl 4):S288 91.
- Cherry JD, Gornbein J, Heininger U, Stehr K. A search for serologic correlates of immunity to *Bordetella pertussis* cough illnesses. Vaccine 1998: 16:1901

 6.
- Rubin LG. Anticapsular antibody requirements for protection against experimental *Haemophilus influenzae* type b bacteremia after splenec tomy. Infect Immun 1988; 56:984

 6.
- Hosea SW, Brown EJ, Hamburger MI, Frank MM. Opsonic require ments for intravascular clearance after splenectomy. N Engl J Med 1981; 304:245
 50.
- Ohmit SE, Petrie JG, Cross RT, Johnson E, Monto AS. Influenza hem agglutination inhibition antibody titer as a correlate of vaccine induced protection. J Infect Dis 2011; 204:1879 85.
- 26. Henckaerts I, Durant N, De Grave D, Schuerman L, Poolman J. Vali dation of a routine opsonophagocytosis assay to predict invasive pneumococcal disease efficacy of conjugate vaccine in children. Vaccine 2007; 25:2518 27.
- Usinger WR, Lucas AH. Avidity as a determinant of the protective ef ficacy of human antibodies to pneumococcal capsular polysaccharides. Infect Immun 1999; 67:2366 70.
- Arvin AM. Immune responses to varicella zoster virus. Infect Dis Clin North Am 1996; 10:529–70.
- No authors listed. Influenza vaccination coverage among pregnant women United States, 2010 11 influenza season. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2011; 60:1078 82.
- 30. Potter J, Stott DJ, Roberts MA, et al. Influenza vaccination of health care workers in long term care hospitals reduces the mortality of elderly patients. J Infect Dis 1997; 175:1 6.
- Carman WF, Elder AG, Wallace LA, et al. Effects of influenza vaccina tion of health care workers on mortality of elderly people in long term care: a randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2000; 355:93
- No authors listed. Influenza vaccination coverage among health care personnel United States, 2010 11 influenza season. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2011; 60:1073 7.
- Castagnini LA, Healy CM, Rench MA, Wootton SH, Munoz FM, Baker CJ. Impact of maternal postpartum tetanus and diphtheria toxoids and acellular pertussis immunization on infant pertussis in fection. Clin Infect Dis 2012; 54:78
- 34. No authors listed. Recommended immunization schedules for persons aged 0 through 18 Years United States, 2012. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2012; 61:1 4.
- Block SL, Yogev R, Hayden FG, Ambrose CS, Zeng W, Walker RE. Shedding and immunogenicity of live attenuated influenza vaccine virus in subjects 5 49 years of age. Vaccine 2008; 26:4940 6.
- Talbot TR, Crocker DD, Peters J, et al. Duration of virus shedding after trivalent intranasal live attenuated influenza vaccination in adults. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 2005; 26:494 500.
- 37. Ali T, Scott N, Kallas W, et al. Detection of influenza antigen with rapid antibody based tests after intranasal influenza vaccination (FluMist). Clin Infect Dis 2004; 38:760 2.
- 38. King JC Jr., Treanor J, Fast PE, et al. Comparison of the safety, vaccine virus shedding, and immunogenicity of influenza virus vaccine, triva lent, types A and B, live cold adapted, administered to human immu nodeficiency virus (HIV) infected and non HIV infected adults. J Infect Dis 2000; 181:725–8.
- King JC Jr., Fast PE, Zangwill KM, et al. Safety, vaccine virus shed ding and immunogenicity of trivalent, cold adapted, live attenuated influenza vaccine administered to human immunodeficiency virus infected and noninfected children. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2001; 20:1124 31.
- 40. Vesikari T, Karvonen A, Korhonen T, et al. A randomized, double blind study of the safety, transmissibility and phenotypic and

- genotypic stability of cold adapted influenza virus vaccine. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2006; 25:590 5.
- Fiore AE, Uyeki TM, Broder K, et al. Prevention and control of influ enza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), 2010. MMWR Recomm Rep 2010; 59:1 62.
- 42. Losonsky GA, Fishaut JM, Strussenberg J, Ogra PL. Effect of immuni zation against rubella on lactation products. II. Maternal neonatal in teractions. J Infect Dis 1982; 145:661 6.
- 43. Traiber C, Coelho Amaral P, Ritter VR, Winge A. Infant meningoen cephalitis caused by yellow fever vaccine virus transmitted via breast milk. J Pediatr (Rio J) 2011; 87:269 72.
- 44. Diaz PS, Au D, Smith S, Amylon M, Link M, Arvin AM. Lack of trans mission of the live attenuated varicella vaccine virus to immunocom promised children after immunization of their siblings. Pediatrics 1991; 87:166–70.
- 45. Marin M, Guris D, Chaves SS, Schmid S, Seward JF. Prevention of var icella: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep 2007; 56:1 40.
- Sharrar RG, LaRussa P, Galea SA, et al. The postmarketing safety profile of varicella vaccine. Vaccine 2000; 19:916 23.
- Grossberg R, Harpaz R, Rubtcova E, Loparev V, Seward JF, Schmid DS. Secondary transmission of varicella vaccine virus in a chronic care facility for children. J Pediatr 2006; 148:842 4.
- 48. Anderson EJ. Rotavirus vaccines: viral shedding and risk of transmis sion. Lancet Infect Dis **2008**; 8:642 9.
- Payne D, Edwards K, Bowen M. Sibling transmission of vaccine derived rotavirus (RotaTeq) associated with rotavirus gastroenteritis (case report). Pediatrics 2010; 125:e438 e41.
- Rivera L, Pena LM, Stainier I, et al. Horizontal transmission of a human rotavirus vaccine strain a randomized, placebo controlled study in twins. Vaccine 2011; 29:9508 13.
- Bernstein HH, Starke JR. Policy statement recommendation for mandatory influenza immunization of all health care personnel. Pedi atrics 2010; 126:809 15.
- Babcock HM, Gemeinhart N, Jones M, Dunagan WC, Woeltje KF. Mandatory influenza vaccination of health care workers: translating policy to practice. Clin Infect Dis 2010; 50:459

 64.
- 53. Pearson ML, Bridges CB, Harper SA. Influenza vaccination of health care personnel: recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee (HICPAC) and the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep 2006; 55:1 16.
- No authors listed. Paralytic poliomyelitis United States, 1980 1994.
 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 1997; 46:79 83.
- 55. DeVries AS, Harper J, Murray A, et al. Vaccine derived poliomyelitis 12 years after infection in Minnesota. N Engl J Med 2011; 364:2316 23.
- 56. Mast EE, Weinbaum CM, Fiore AE, et al. A comprehensive immuni zation strategy to eliminate transmission of hepatitis B virus infection in the United States: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) Part II: immunization of adults. MMWR Recomm Rep 2006; 55:1 33; quiz CE1 4.
- 57. Fonseca MO, Pang LW, de Paula Cavalheiro N, Barone AA, Heloisa Lopes M. Randomized trial of recombinant hepatitis B vaccine in HIV infected adult patients comparing a standard dose to a double dose. Vaccine 2005; 23:2902 8.
- 58. Launay O, van der Vliet D, Rosenberg AR, et al. Safety and immuno genicity of 4 intramuscular double doses and 4 intradermal low doses vs standard hepatitis B vaccine regimen in adults with HIV 1: a ran domized controlled trial. JAMA 2011; 305:1432 40.
- Atkinson WL, Kroger A, Pickering LK. Section 1: General aspects of vaccination, Part 7: General immunization practices. Vaccine 2008; 57:723
- Jong E, Freedman D. The immunocompromised traveler. 2010, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 46 of 57

- Brunette G, Kozarsky P, Magil l A, Shlim D. CDC health information for international travel 2010. Yellow Book, 2010, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Staples JE, Gershman M, Fischer M. Yellow fever vaccine: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep 2010; 59:1–27.
- Mota LM, Oliveira AC, Lima RA, Santos Neto LL, Tauil PL. Vaccina tion against yellow fever among patients on immunosuppressors with diagnoses of rheumatic diseases. Rev Soc Bras Med Trop 2009; 42:23 7.
- Rio B. Vaccination for yellow fever after bone marrow transplantation.
 Bone Marrow Transplant, 1996; 17(1 Suppl):95.
- Gowda R, Cartwright K, Bremner JA, Green ST. Yellow fever vaccine: a successful vaccination of an immunocompromised patient. Eur J Haematol 2004; 72:299 301.
- 66. Yax JA, Farnon EC, Cary Engleberg N. Successful immunization of an allogeneic bone marrow transplant recipient with live, attenuated yellow fever vaccine. J Travel Med 2009; 16:365 7.
- Veit O, Niedrig M, Chapuis Taillard C, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of yellow fever vaccination for 102 HIV infected patients. Clin Infect Dis 2009; 48:659
 66.
- 68. Sidibe M, Yactayo S, Kalle A, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of yellow fever vaccine among 115 HIV infected patients after a preven tive immunisation campaign in Mali. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg 2012; 106:437 44.
- Farez MF, Correale J. Yellow fever vaccination and increased relapse rate in travelers with multiple sclerosis. Arch Neurol 2011; 68:1267
 71.
- Feldman S, Hughes WT, Daniel CB. Varicella in children with cancer: Seventy seven cases. Pediatrics 1975; 56:388
 97.
- Lynfield R, Herrin JT, Rubin RH. Varicella in pediatric renal trans plant recipients. Pediatrics 1992; 90:216 20.
- 72. Hambleton S. Chickenpox. Curr Opin Infect Dis 2005; 18:235 40.
- 73. Schrauder A, Henke Gendo C, Seidemann K, et al. Varicella vaccination in a child with acute lymphoblastic leukaemia. Lancet **2007**; 369:1232.
- 74. Kraft JN, Shaw JC. Varicella infection caused by Oka strain vaccine in a heart transplant recipient. Arch Dermatol **2006**; 142:943 5.
- Ngai AL, Staehle BO, Kuter BJ, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of one vs. two injections of Oka/Merck varicella vaccine in healthy chil dren. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1996; 15:49 54.
- Bryan CJ, Prichard MN, Daily S, et al. Acyclovir resistant chronic ver rucous vaccine strain varicella in a patient with neuroblastoma. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2008; 27:946 8.
- 77. Levin MJ, Dahl KM, Weinberg A, Giller R, Patel A, Krause PR. Devel opment of resistance to acyclovir during chronic infection with the Oka vaccine strain of varicella zoster virus in an immunosuppressed child. J Infect Dis 2003; 188:954–9.
- Gershon AA, LaRussa P, Steinberg S. The varicella vaccine. Clinical trials in immunocompromised individuals. Infect Dis Clin North Am 1996; 10:583 94.
- Levin MJ, Gershon AA, Weinberg A, Song LY, Fentin T, Nowak B. Administration of live varicella vaccine to HIV infected children with current or past significant depression of CD4(+) T cells. J Infect Dis 2006; 194:247 55.
- Gershon AA, Steinberg SP, Gelb L. Live attenuated varicella vaccine use in immunocompromised children and adults. Pediatrics 1986; 78:757
 62.
- Gershon AA, Steinberg SP. Persistence of immunity to varicella in children with leukemia immunized with live attenuated varicella vaccine. N Engl J Med 1989; 320:892 7.
- Takahashi M, Kamiya H, Baba K, Asano Y, Ozaki T, Horiuchi K. Clin ical experience with Oka live varicella vaccine in Japan. Postgrad Med J 1985; 61 (Suppl 4):61 7.
- Takahashi M. Clinical overview of varicella vaccine: development and early studies. Pediatrics 1986; 78:736–41.
- Levin MJ. Varicella vaccination of immunocompromised children. J Infect Dis 2008; 197 (Suppl 2):S200 6.

- Sauerbrei A, Prager J, Hengst U, Zintl F, Wutzler P. Varicella vaccina tion in children after bone marrow transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant 1997; 20:381 3.
- Small TN, Robinson WH, Miklos DB. B cells and transplantation: an educational resource. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2009; 15:104

 13.
- 87. Chou JF, Kernan NA, Prockop S, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of the live attenuated varicella vaccine following T replete or T cell depleted related and unrelated allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (alloHCT). Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2011; 17:1708 13.
- Levin MJ, Gershon AA, Weinberg A, et al. Immunization of HIV in fected children with varicella vaccine. J Pediatr 2001; 139:305 10.
- Wood SM, Shah SS, Steenhoff AP, Rutstein RM. Primary varicella and herpes zoster among HIV infected children from 1989 to 2006. Pedi atrics 2008; 121:e150 6.
- 90. Dowell SF, Bresee JS. Severe varicella associated with steroid use. Pedi atrics 1993; 92:223 8.
- 91. Lydick E, Kuter BJ, Zajac BA, Guess HA. Association of steroid therapy with vaccine associated rashes in children with acute lympho cytic leukaemia who received Oka/Merck varicella vaccine. NIAID Varicella Vaccine Collaborative Study Group. Vaccine 1989; 7:549 53.
- 92. Lu Y, Bousvaros A. Varicella vaccination in children with inflammato ry bowel disease receiving immunosuppressive therapy. J Pediatr Gas troenterol Nutr 2010; 50:562 5.
- Pileggi GS, de Souza CB, Ferriani VP. Safety and immunogenicity of varicella vaccine in patients with juvenile rheumatic diseases receiving methotrexate and corticosteroids. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken) 2010; 62:1034 9.
- Klein NP, Fireman B, Yih WK, et al. Measles mumps rubella varicella combination vaccine and the risk of febrile seizures. Pediatrics 2010; 126:e1 8.
- Jacobsen SJ, Ackerson BK, Sy LS, et al. Observational safety study of febrile convulsion following first dose MMRV vaccination in a managed care setting. Vaccine 2009; 27:4656
 61.
- 96. Schlienger K, Lange J, Tyring S. Immunogenicity, kinetics of VZV specific CD4 T cell g IFN production and safety of a live attenuated Oka/Merck zoster vaccine in healthy adults ≥60 years of age. Clin Vaccine Immunol 2009; 16: 1381 1382.
- Naidus E, Damon L, Schwartz BS, Breed C, Liu C. Experience with use of Zostavax () in patients with hematologic malignancy and he matopoietic cell transplant recipients. Am J Hematol 2012; 87:123 5.
- Strangfeld A, Listing J, Herzer P, et al. Risk of herpes zoster in patients with rheumatoid arthritis treated with anti TNF alpha agents. JAMA 2009; 301:737 44.
- Wendling D, Streit G, Toussirot E, Prati C. Herpes zoster in patients taking TNFalpha antagonists for chronic inflammatory joint disease. Joint Bone Spine 2008; 75:540 3.
- Del Porto F, Lagana B, Biselli R, et al. Influenza vaccine administration in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and rheumatoid arthri tis. Safety and immunogenicity. Vaccine 2006; 24:3217 23.
- 101. Oren S, Mandelboim M, Braun Moscovici Y, et al. Vaccination against influenza in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: the effect of rituximab on the humoral response. Ann Rheum Dis 2008; 67:937 41.
- 102. Fowke KR, D'Amico R, Chernoff DN, et al. Immunologic and virolog ic evaluation after influenza vaccination of HIV 1 infected patients. AIDS 1997; 11:1013 21.
- 103. Edvardsson VO, Flynn JT, Deforest A, et al. Effective immunization against influenza in pediatric renal transplant recipients. Clin Trans plant 1996; 10:556 60.
- 104. Duchini A, Hendry RM, Nyberg LM, Viernes ME, Pockros PJ. Immune response to influenza vaccine in adult liver transplant recipi ents. Liver Transpl 2001; 7:311 3.
- 105. van Assen S, Holvast A, Telgt DS, et al. Patients with humoral primary immunodeficiency do not develop protective anti influenza antibody titers after vaccination with trivalent subunit influenza vaccine. Clin Immunol 2010; 136:228 35.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 47 of 57

- 106. Levin MJ, Song LY, Fenton T, et al. Shedding of live vaccine virus, comparative safety, and influenza specific antibody responses after ad ministration of live attenuated and inactivated trivalent influenza vaccines to HIV infected children. Vaccine 2008; 26:4210 7.
- 107. Carr S, Allison KJ, Van De Velde LA, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of live attenuated and inactivated influenza vaccines in children with cancer. J Infect Dis 2011; 204:1475 82.
- Notarangelo LD. Primary immunodeficiencies. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2010; 125:S182 94.
- 109. No authors listed. Use of 13 valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine and 23 valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine for adults with immunocompromising conditions: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2012; 61:816 9.
- 110. Andreoni J, Kayhty H, Densen P. Vaccination and the role of capsular polysaccharide antibody in prevention of recurrent meningococcal disease in late complement component deficient individuals. J Infect Dis 1993; 168:227 31.
- 111. Biselli R, Casapollo I, D'Amelio R, Salvato S, Matricardi PM, Brai M. Antibody response to meningococcal polysaccharides A and C in patients with complement defects. Scand J Immunol 1993; 37:644 50.
- 112. Drogari Apiranthitou M, Fijen CA, Van De Beek D, Hensen EF, Dankert J, Kuijper EJ. Development of antibodies against tetravalent meningococcal polysaccharides in revaccinated complement deficient patients. Clin Exp Immunol 2000; 119:311 6.
- 113. Fijen CA, Kuijper EJ, Drogari Apiranthitou M, Van Leeuwen Y, Daha MRDankert J. Protection against meningococcal serogroup ACYW disease in complement deficient individuals vaccinated with the tetra valent meningococcal capsular polysaccharide vaccine. Clin Exp Immunol 1998; 114:362 9.
- 114. Platonov AE, Beloborodov VB, Pavlova LI, Vershinina IV, Kayhty H. Vaccination of patients deficient in a late complement component with tetravalent meningococcal capsular polysaccharide vaccine. Clin Exp Immunol 1995; 100:32 9.
- 115. Platonov AE, Vershinina IV, Kuijper EJ, Borrow R, Kayhty H. Long term effects of vaccination of patients deficient in a late complement component with a tetravalent meningococcal polysaccharide vaccine. Vaccine 2003; 21:4437–47.
- 116. Soderstrom C, Braconier JH, Kayhty H, Sjoholm AG, Thuresson B. Immune response to tetravalent meningococcal vaccine: opsonic and bactericidal functions of normal and properdin deficient sera. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 1989; 8:220 4.
- 117. No authors listed. Infant meningococcal vaccination: Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommendations and rationale. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2013; 62:52 4.
- 118. Vu DM, Welsch JA, Zuno Mitchell P, Dela Cruz JV, Granoff DM. An tibody persistence 3 years after immunization of adolescents with quadrivalent meningococcal conjugate vaccine. J Infect Dis 2006; 193:821 8.
- 119. Gill CJ, Baxter R, Anemona A, Ciavarro G, Dull P. Persistence of immune responses after a single dose of Novartis meningococcal se rogroup A, C, W 135 and Y CRM 197 conjugate vaccine (Menveo) or Menactra among healthy adolescents. Hum Vaccin 2010; 6:881 7.
- Attwood JT, Williams Y, Feighery C. Impaired IgG responses in a child with homozygous C2 deficiency and recurrent pneumococcal septicaemia. Acta Paediatr 2001; 90:99
 101.
- 121. Berkel AI. Studies of immune response in a patient with selective complete C1q deficiency. Turk J Pediatr 1993; 35:221 6.
- Hohler T, Stradmann Bellinghausen B, Starke R, et al. C4A deficiency and nonresponse to hepatitis B vaccination. J Hepatol 2002; 37:387-92
- 123. Jackson CG, Ochs HD, Wedgwood RJ. Immune response of a patient with deficiency of the fourth component of complement and systemic lupus erythematosus. N Engl J Med 1979; 300:1124 9.
- 124. No authors listed. Licensure of a 13 valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine (PCV13) and recommendations for use among children

- Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), 2010. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2010; 59:258 61.
- 125. Walter ND, Taylor TH, Shay DK, et al. Influenza circulation and the burden of invasive pneumococcal pneumonia during a non pandemic period in the United States. Clin Infect Dis 2010; 50:175 83.
- 126. Jansen AG, Sanders EA, Van Der Ende A, Van Loon AM, Hoes AW, Hak E. Invasive pneumococcal and meningococcal disease: associa tion with influenza virus and respiratory syncytial virus activity? Epi demiol Infect 2008; 136:1448 54.
- 127. Winkelstein JA, Marino MC, Johnston RB Jr., et al. Chronic granulo matous disease. Report on a national registry of 368 patients. Medicine (Baltimore) 2000; 79:155 69.
- 128. van den Berg JM, van Koppen E, Ahlin A, et al. Chronic granuloma tous disease: the European experience. PLoS One 2009; 4:e5234.
- 129. Finelli L, Fiore A, Dhara R, et al. Influenza associated pediatric mor tality in the United States: increase of *Staphylococcus aureus* coinfection. Pediatrics **2008**; 122:805–11.
- Voss LM, Abraham RT, Rhodes KH, Schoon RA, Leibson PJ. Defective T lymphocyte signal transduction and function in leukocyte ad hesion deficiency. J Clin Immunol 1991; 11:175
 83.
- 131. Baetz K, Isaaz S, Griffiths GM. Loss of cytotoxic T lymphocyte function in Chediak Higashi syndrome arises from a secretory defect that prevents lytic granule exocytosis. J Immunol 1995; 154:6122 31.
- 132. Kobayashi Y, Komazawa Y, Kobayashi M, et al. Presumed BCG infection in a boy with chronic granulomatous disease. A report of a case and a review of the literature. Clin Pediatr (Phila) 1984; 23:586 9.
- Smith PA, Wittenberg DF. Disseminated BCG infection in a child with chronic granulomatous disease. A case report. S Afr Med J 1984; 65:821
- 134. Kawashima H, Hasegawa D, Nakamura M, et al. Hazards of early BCG vaccination: BCGitis in a patient with chronic granulomatous disease. Pediatr Int 2007; 49:418 9.
- 135. Kusuhara K, Ohga S, Hoshina T, et al. Disseminated bacillus Calm ette Guerin lymphadenitis in a patient with gp91phox chronic granu lomatous disease 25 years after vaccination. Eur J Pediatr 2009; 168:745 7.
- 136. Mansouri D, Adimi P, Mirsaeidi M, et al. Inherited disorders of the IL 12 IFN gamma axis in patients with disseminated BCG infection. Eur J Pediatr 2005; 164:753 7.
- 137. Dai YS, Liang MG, Gellis SE, et al. Characteristics of mycobacterial in fection in patients with immunodeficiency and nuclear factor kappaB essential modulator mutation, with or without ectodermal dysplasia. J Am Acad Dermatol 2004; 51:718 22.
- 138. Orange JS, Jain A, Ballas ZK, Schneider LC, Geha RS, Bonilla FA. The presentation and natural history of immunodeficiency caused by nuclear factor kappaB essential modulator mutation. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2004; 113:725 33.
- 139. Pasic S, Lilic D, Pejnovic N, Vojvodic D, Simic R, Abinun M. Dissemi nated bacillus Calmette Guerin infection in a girl with hyperimmuno globulin E syndrome. Acta Paediatr 1998; 87:702 4.
- Pasic S. Local bacillus Calmette Guerin infection in hyperimmunoglo bulin E syndrome. Acta Paediatr 2002; 91:1271
- 141. Zhang SY, Boisson Dupuis S, Chapgier A, et al. Inborn errors of inter feron (IFN) mediated immunity in humans: insights into the respec tive roles of IFN alpha/beta, IFN gamma, and IFN lambda in host defense. Immunol Rev 2008; 226:29 40.
- 142. Dupuis S, Jouanguy E, Al Hajjar S, et al. Impaired response to inter feron alpha/beta and lethal viral disease in human STAT1 deficiency. Nat Genet 2003; 33:388 91.
- 143. Schubert MS, Moss RB. Selective polysaccharide antibody deficiency in familial DiGeorge syndrome. Ann Allergy 1992; 69:231 8.
- 144. Gennery AR, Barge D, O'Sullivan JJ, Flood TJ, Abinun M, Cant AJ. Antibody deficiency and autoimmunity in 22q11.2 deletion syndrome. Arch Dis Child 2002; 86:422 5.
- 145. Kirkpatrick CH. Specific polysaccharide antibody deficiency. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol **2006**; 97:271.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 48 of 57

- 146. Shrimpton A, Duddridge M, Ziegler Heitbrock L. Vaccination with polysaccharide conjugate vaccines in adult patients with specific anti body deficiency. Vaccine 2006; 24:3574–80.
- 147. Schubert R, Reichenbach J, Rose M, Zielen S. Immunogenicity of the seven valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine in patients with ataxia telangiectasia. Pediatr Infect Dis J **2004**; 23:269 70.
- 148. Sanal O, Ersoy F, Tezcan I, et al. Antibody response to a seven valent pneumococcal conjugated vaccine in patients with ataxia telangiecta sia. J Clin Immunol 2004; 24:411 7.
- 149. Stray Pedersen A, Aaberge IS, Fruh A, Abrahamsen TG. Pneumococcal conjugate vaccine followed by pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine; immunogenicity in patients with ataxia telangiectasia. Clin Exp Immunol 2005; 140:507–16.
- Asindi AA, Bell EJ, Browning MJ, Stephenson JB. Vaccine induced polioencephalomyelitis in Scotland. Scott Med J 1988; 33:306 7.
- 151. Inaba H, Hori H, Ito M, et al. Polio vaccine virus associated meningo encephalitis in an infant with transient hypogammaglobulinemia. Scand J Infect Dis 2001; 33:630 1.
- 152. Martin J. Vaccine derived poliovirus from long term excretors and the end game of polio eradication. Biologicals **2006**; 34:117–22.
- 153. Rezaei N, Aghamohammadi A, Read RC. Response to polysaccharide vaccination amongst pediatric patients with common variable immu nodeficiency correlates with clinical disease. Iran J Allergy Asthma Immunol 2008; 7:231 4.
- Goldacker S, Draeger R, Warnatz K, et al. Active vaccination in patients with common variable immunodeficiency (CVID). Clin Immunol 2007; 124:294 303.
- 155. Rezaei N, Siadat SD, Aghamohammadi A, et al. Serum bactericidal an tibody response 1 year after meningococcal polysaccharide vaccina tion of patients with common variable immunodeficiency. Clin Vaccine Immunol 2010; 17:524–8.
- 156. Hidalgo S, Garcia Erro M, Cisterna D, Freire MC. Paralytic poliomy elitis caused by a vaccine derived polio virus in an antibody deficient Argentinean child. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2003; 22:570 2.
- Misbah SA, Lawrence PA, Kurtz JB, Chapel HM. Prolonged faecal ex cretion of poliovirus in a nurse with common variable hypogamma globulinaemia. Postgrad Med J 1991; 67:301

 3.
- 158. Shahmahmoodi S, Parvaneh N, Burns C, et al. Isolation of a type 3 vaccine derived poliovirus (VDPV) from an Iranian child with X linked agammaglobulinemia. Virus Res 2008; 137:168-72.
- Fiore L, Plebani A, Buttinelli G, et al. Search for poliovirus long term ex cretors among patients affected by agammaglobulinemia. Clin Immunol 2004; 111:98
 102.
- 160. Halsey NA, Pinto J, Espinosa Rosales F, et al. Search for poliovirus carriers among people with primary immune deficiency diseases in the United States, Mexico, Brazil, and the United Kingdom. Bull World Health Organ 2004; 82:3 8.
- 161. Werther RL, Crawford NW, Boniface K, Kirkwood CD, Smart JM. Rotavirus vaccine induced diarrhea in a child with severe combined immune deficiency. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2009; 124:600.
- Patel NC, Hertel PM, Estes MK, et al. Vaccine acquired rotavirus in infants with severe combined immunodeficiency. N Engl J Med 2010; 362:314
- 163. Uygungil B, Bleesing JJ, Risma KA, McNeal MM, Rothenberg ME. Persistent rotavirus vaccine shedding in a new case of severe combined immunodeficiency: A reason to screen. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2010; 125:270 1.
- 164. Azzari C, Gambineri E, Resti M, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of measles mumps rubella vaccine in children with congenital immunodeficiency (DiGeorge syndrome). Vaccine 2005; 23: 1668 71.
- 165. Moylett EH, Wasan AN, Noroski LM, Shearer WT. Live viral vaccines in patients with partial DiGeorge syndrome: clinical experience and cellular immunity. Clin Immunol 2004; 112:106 12.
- 166. Perez EE, Bokszczanin A, McDonald McGinn D, Zackai EH, Sullivan KE. Safety of live viral vaccines in patients with chromosome 22q11.2

- deletion syndrome (DiGeorge syndrome/velocardiofacial syndrome). Pediatrics 2003; 112:e325.
- 167. Al Sukaiti N, Reid B, Lavi S, et al. Safety and efficacy of measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine in patients with DiGeorge syndrome. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2010; 126:868 9.
- 168. Ermolovich MA, Fel'dman EV, Samoilovich EO, Kuzovkova NA, Levin VI. Characterization of the immune status of patients with vaccine associated poliomyelitis. Zh Mikrobiol Epidemiol Immuno biol 2002:42 50.
- Mihatsch MJ, Ohnacker H, Just M, Nars PW. Lethal measles giant cell pneumonia after live measles vaccination in a case of thymic alympho plasia Gitlin. Helv Paediatr Acta 1972; 27:143 6.
- 170. Monafo WJ, Haslam DB, Roberts RL, Zaki SR, Bellini WJ, Coffin CM. Disseminated measles infection after vaccination in a child with a congenital immunodeficiency. J Pediatr 1994; 124:273 6.
- 171. Schuil J, van de Putte EM, Zwaan CM, Koole FD, Meire FM. Retinop athy following measles, mumps, and rubella vaccination in an immuno incompetent girl. Int Ophthalmol 1998; 22:345 7.
- 172. Bakare N, Menschik D, Tiernan R, Hua W, Martin D. Severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID) and rotavirus vaccination: reports to the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS). Vaccine 2010: 28:6609—12.
- 173. Egeler RM, Shapiro R, Loechelt B, Filipovich A. Characteristic immune abnormalities in hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 1996; 18:340 5.
- 174. Yeganeh M, Heidarzade M, Pourpak Z, et al. Severe combined immu nodeficiency: a cohort of 40 patients. Pediatr Allergy Immunol 2008; 19:303 6.
- 175. Donovan RM, Moore E, Bush CE, Markowitz NP, Saravolatz LD. Changes in plasma HIV RNA levels and CD4 cell counts after vaccination of pediatric patients. AIDS 1997; 11:1054 6.
- 176. Calmy A, Bel M, Nguyen A, et al. Strong serological responses and HIV RNA increase following ASO3 adjuvanted pandemic immuniza tion in HIV infected patients. HIV Med 2012; 13:207 18.
- 177. Weinberg A, Gona P, Nachman SA, et al. Antibody responses to hepa titis A virus vaccine in HIV infected children with evidence of immu nologic reconstitution while receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy. J Infect Dis 2006; 193:302 11.
- 178. Abzug MJ, Pelton SI, Song LY, et al. Immunogenicity, safety, and pre dictors of response after a pneumococcal conjugate and pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine series in human immunodeficiency virus in fected children receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2006; 25:920 9.
- Abzug MJ, Song LY, Fenton T, et al. Pertussis booster vaccination in HIV infected children receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy. Pediatrics 2007; 120:e1190 202.
- 180. Levin MJ, Moscicki AB, Song LY, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of a quadrivalent human papillomavirus (types 6, 11, 16, and 18) vaccine in HIV infected children 7 to 12 years old. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2010:197 204.
- 181. Weinberg A, Song LY, Fenton T, et al. T cell responses of HIV infected children after administration of inactivated or live attenuated influen za vaccines. AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses 2010; 26:51 9.
- 182. Madhi SA, Kuwanda L, Saarinen L, et al. Immunogenicity and effectiveness of *Haemophilus influenzae* type b conjugate vaccine in HIV infected and uninfected African children. Vaccine 2005; 23:5517–25.
- 183. Tedaldi EM, Baker RK, Moorman AC, et al. Hepatitis A and B vaccina tion practices for ambulatory patients infected with HIV. Clin Infect Dis 2004; 38:1478 84.
- 184. Sutcliffe CG, Moss WJ. Do children infected with HIV receiving HAART need to be revaccinated? Lancet Infect Dis 2010; 10:630 42.
- 185. Miotti PG, Nelson KE, Dallabetta GA, Farzadegan H, Margolick J, Clements ML. The influence of HIV infection on antibody responses to a two dose regimen of influenza vaccine. JAMA 1989, 262:779 83.
- 186. Chadwick EG, Chang G, Decker MD, Yogev R, Dimichele D, Edwards KM. Serologic response to standard inactivated influenza vaccine in

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 49 of 57

- human immunodeficiency virus infected children. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1994; 13:206 11.
- 187. Kroon FP, van Dissel JT, de Jong JC, van Furth R. Antibody response to influenza, tetanus and pneumococcal vaccines in HIV seropositive individuals in relation to the number of CD4+ lymphocytes. AIDS 1994; 8:469–76.
- 188. Vigano A, Zuccotti GV, Pacei M, et al. Humoral and cellular response to influenza vaccine in HIV infected children with full viroimmuno logic response to antiretroviral therapy. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2008; 48:289 96.
- 189. Madhi SA, Maskew M, Koen A, et al. Trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine in African adults infected with human immunodeficient virus: double blind, randomized clinical trial of efficacy, immunogenicity, and safety. Clin Infect Dis 2011; 52:128 37.
- 190. O'Brien WA, Grovit Ferbas K, Namazi A, et al. Human immunodeficiency virus type 1 replication can be increased in peripheral blood of seropositive patients after influenza vaccination. Blood 1995; 86:1082 9.
- 191. Rosok B, Voltersvik P, Bjerknes R, Axelsson M, Haaheim LR, Asjo B. Dynamics of HIV 1 replication following influenza vaccination of HIV+ individuals. Clin Exp Immunol 1996; 104:203 7.
- 192. Glesby MJ, Hoover DR, Farzadegan H, Margolick JB, Saah AJ. The effect of influenza vaccination on human immunodeficiency virus type 1 load: a randomized, double blind, placebo controlled study. J Infect Dis 1996; 174:1332 6.
- 193. Tasker SA, O'Brien WA, Treanor JJ, et al. Effects of influenza vaccina tion in HIV infected adults: a double blind, placebo controlled trial. Vaccine 1998; 16:1039 42.
- 194. Crum Cianflone NF, Eberly LE, Duplessis C, et al. Immunogenicity of a monovalent 2009 influenza A (H1N1) vaccine in an immunocom promised population: a prospective study comparing HIV infected adults with HIV uninfected adults. Clin Infect Dis 2011; 52:138 46.
- Flynn P, Nachman S, Spector SA. H1N1 immunization in HIV 1 perinatally infected children and youth. J Infect Dis. 2012; 206:421–30.
- 196. Madhi SA, Adrian P, Kuwanda L, et al. Long term immunogenicity and efficacy of a 9 valent conjugate pneumococcal vaccine in human immunodeficient virus infected and non infected children in the absence of a booster dose of vaccine. Vaccine 2007; 25:2451 7.
- 197. Dworkin MS, Ward JW, Hanson DL, Jones JL, Kaplan JE. Pneumo coccal disease among human immunodeficiency virus infected persons: incidence, risk factors, and impact of vaccination. Clin Infect Dis 2001; 32:794–800.
- 198. Klugman KP, Madhi SA, Huebner RE, Kohberger R, Mbelle N, Pierce N. A trial of a 9 valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine in children with and those without HIV infection. N Engl J Med 2003; 349:1341 8.
- 199. Nachman S, Kim S, King J, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of a hep tavalent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine in infants with human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. Pediatrics **2003**; 112:66–73.
- Arpadi SM, Back S, O'Brien J, Janoff EN. Antibodies to pneumococcal capsular polysaccharides in children with human immunodeficiency virus infection given polyvalent pneumococcal vaccine. J Pediatr 1994; 125:77 9.
- 201. King JC Jr., Vink PE, Farley JJ, et al. Comparison of the safety and im munogenicity of a pneumococcal conjugate with a licensed polysac charide vaccine in human immunodeficiency virus and non human immunodeficiency virus infected children. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1996; 15:192 6.
- 202. Tangsinmankong N, Kamchaisatian W, Day NK, Sleasman JW, Em manuel PJ. Immunogenicity of 23 valent pneumococcal polysaccha ride vaccine in children with human immunodeficiency virus undergoing highly active antiretroviral therapy. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 2004; 92:558 64.
- 203. Madhi SA, Klugman KP, Kuwanda L, Cutland C, Kayhty H, Adrian P. Quantitative and qualitative anamnestic immune responses to pneu mococcal conjugate vaccine in HIV infected and HIV uninfected children 5 years after vaccination. J Infect Dis 2009; 199:1168–76.

- Lesprit P, Pedrono G, Molina JM, et al. Immunological efficacy of a prime boost pneumococcal vaccination in HIV infected adults. AIDS 2007; 21:2425 34.
- French N, Gordon SB, Mwalukomo T, et al. A trial of a 7 valent pneu mococcal conjugate vaccine in HIV infected adults. N Engl J Med 2010; 362:812 22.
- 206. Hung CC, Chen MY, Hsieh SM, Hsiao CF, Sheng WH, Chang SC. Clinical experience of the 23 valent capsular polysaccharide pneumo coccal vaccination in HIV 1 infected patients receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy: a prospective observational study. Vaccine 2004; 22:2006 12.
- 207. Grau I, Pallares R, Tubau F, et al. Epidemiologic changes in bacteremic pneumococcal disease in patients with human immunodeficiency virus in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy. Arch Intern Med 2005; 165:1533 40.
- 208. Watera C, Nakiyingi J, Miiro G, et al. 23 valent pneumococcal poly saccharide vaccine in HIV infected Ugandan adults: 6 year follow up of a clinical trial cohort. AIDS 2004; 18:1210 3.
- French N, Nakiyingi J, Carpenter LM, et al. 23 valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine in HIV 1 infected Ugandan adults: double blind, randomised and placebo controlled trial. Lancet 2000; 355:2106
 11.
- 210. Gibb D, Giacomelli A, Masters J, et al. Persistence of antibody re sponses to *Haemophilus influenzae* type b polysaccharide conjugate vaccine in children with vertically acquired human immunodeficiency virus infection. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1996; 15:1097 101.
- 211. Madhi SA, Petersen K, Khoosal M, et al. Reduced effectiveness of *Hae mophilus influenzae* type b conjugate vaccine in children with a high prevalence of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2002; 21:315–21.
- 212. Daza P, Banda R, Misoya K, et al. The impact of routine infant immu nization with *Haemophilus influenzae* type b conjugate vaccine in Malawi, a country with high human immunodeficiency virus preva lence. Vaccine 2006; 24:6232 9.
- 213. Borrow R, Southern J, Andrews N, et al. Comparison of antibody kinetics following meningococcal serogroup C conjugate vaccine between healthy adults previously vaccinated with meningococcal A/C polysaccharide vaccine and vaccine naive controls. Vaccine 2001; 19:3043 50.
- 214. Richmond P, Kaczmarski E, Borrow R, et al. Meningococcal C poly saccharide vaccine induces immunologic hyporesponsiveness in adults that is overcome by meningococcal C conjugate vaccine. J Infect Dis 2000; 181:761 4.
- 215. Siberry GK, Williams PL, Lujan Zilbermann J, et al. Phase I/II, open label trial of safety and immunogenicity of meningococcal (groups A, C, Y, and W 135) polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate vaccine in human immunodeficiency virus infected adolescents. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2010; 29:391 6.
- 216. Siberry GK, Warshaw MG, Williams PL, et al. Safety and immunoge nicity of quadrivalent meningococcal conjugate vaccine in 2 to 10 year old human immunodeficiency virus infected children. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2012; 31:47 52.
- 217. de Martino M, Podda A, Galli L, et al. Acellular pertussis vaccine in children with perinatal human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. Vaccine 1997; 15:1235 8.
- 218. Farquhar C, Wamalwa D, Selig S, et al. Immune responses to measles and tetanus vaccines among Kenyan human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV 1) infected children pre and post highly active antiretro viral therapy and revaccination. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2009; 28:295 9.
- 219. Melvin AJ, Mohan KM. Response to immunization with measles, tetanus, and *Haemophilus influenzae* type b vaccines in children who have human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection and are treated with highly active antiretroviral therapy. Pediatrics 2003; 111:e641 4.
- Rosenblatt HM, Song LY, Nachman SA, et al. Tetanus immunity after diphtheria, tetanus toxoids, and acellular pertussis vaccination in chil dren with clinically stable HIV infection. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2005; 116:698 703.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 50 of 57

- 221. Tovo PA, de Martino M, Gabiano C, Galli L. Pertussis immunization in HIV 1 infected infants: a model to assess the effects of repeated T cell dependent antigen administrations on HIV 1 progression. Italian Register for HIV infection in children. Vaccine 2000; 18:1203 9.
- 222. Xu WM, Cui YT, Wang L, et al. Lamivudine in late pregnancy to prevent perinatal transmission of hepatitis B virus infection: a multi centre, randomized, double blind, placebo controlled study. J Viral Hepat 2009; 16:94 103.
- 223. Pickering LK, Baker CJ, Kimberlin DW, Long SS, Red Book: 2012 report of the Committee on Infectious Diseases. 29 ed. Elk Grove Village: American Academy of Pediatrics, 2012.
- Collier AC, Corey L, Murphy VL, Handsfield HH. Antibody to human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and suboptimal response to hepatitis B vaccination. Ann Intern Med 1988; 109:101 5.
- Pasricha N, Datta U, Chawla Y, et al. Immune responses in patients with HIV infection after vaccination with recombinant hepatitis B virus vaccine. BMC Infect Dis 2006; 6:65.
- 226. Veiga AP, Casseb J, Duarte AJ. Humoral response to hepatitis B vaccination and its relationship with T CD45RA+ (naive) and CD45RO+ (memory) subsets in HIV 1 infected subjects. Vaccine 2006; 24:7124 8.
- 227. Cornejo Juarez P, Volkow Fernandez P, Escobedo Lopez K, Vilar Compte D, Ruiz Palacios G, Soto Ramirez LE. Randomized controlled trial of hepatitis B virus vaccine in HIV 1 infected patients comparing two different doses. AIDS Res Ther 2006; 3:9.
- 228. Kim HN, Harrington RD, Van Rompaey SE, Kitahata MM. Independent clinical predictors of impaired response to hepatitis B vaccination in HIV infected persons. Int J STD AIDS 2008; 19:600 4.
- 229. Keet IP, van Doornum G, Safary A, Coutinho RA. Insufficient re sponse to hepatitis B vaccination in HIV positive homosexual men. AIDS 1992; 6:509 10.
- 230. Abzug MJ, Warshaw M, Rosenblatt HM, et al. Immunogenicity and immunologic memory after hepatitis B virus booster vaccination in HIV infected children receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy. J Infect Dis 2009; 200:935–46.
- Laurence JC. Hepatitis A and B immunizations of individuals infected with human immunodeficiency virus. Am J Med 2005; 118 (Suppl 10A):75S 83.
- 232. Overton ET, Sungkanuparph S, Powderly WG, Seyfried W, Groger RKAberg JA. Undetectable plasma HIV RNA load predicts success after hepatitis B vaccination in HIV infected persons. Clin Infect Dis 2005; 41:1045 8.
- 233. Cruciani M, Mengoli C, Serpelloni G, et al. Serologic response to hep atitis B vaccine with high dose and increasing number of injections in HIV infected adult patients. Vaccine **2009**; 27:17 22.
- Zuin G, Principi N, Tornaghi R, et al. Impaired response to hepatitis B vaccine in HIV infected children. Vaccine 1992; 10:857

 60.
- 235. Irungu E, Mugo N, Ngure K, et al. Immune response to hepatitis B virus vaccination among HIV 1 infected and uninfected adults in Kenya. J Infect Dis 2013; 207:402 10.
- 236. Rey D, Krantz V, Partisani M, et al. Increasing the number of hepatitis B vaccine injections augments anti HBs response rate in HIV infected patients. Effects on HIV 1 viral load. Vaccine 2000; 18:1161 5.
- Scolfaro C, Fiammengo P, Balbo L, Madon E, Tovo PA. Hepatitis B vaccination in HIV 1 infected children: double efficacy doubling the paediatric dose. AIDS 1996; 10:1169
 70.
- Flynn M, Kort R. XVII International AIDS Conference: From Evidence to Action Epidemiology. J Int AIDS Soc 2009; 12 (Suppl 1):S2.
- 239. Lao Araya M, Puthanakit T, Aurpibul L, Taecharoenkul S, Sirisantha na T, Sirisanthana V. Prevalence of protective level of hepatitis B anti body 3 years after revaccination in HIV infected children on antiretroviral therapy. Vaccine 2011; 29:3977–81.
- 240. Poovorawan Y, Chongsrisawat V, Theamboonlers A, et al. Long term benefit of hepatitis B vaccination among children in Thailand with transient hepatitis B virus infection who were born to hepatitis B surface antigen positive mothers. J Infect Dis 2009; 200:33 8.

- 241. Jongjirawisan Y, Ungulkraiwit P, Sungkanuparph S. Isolated antibody to hepatitis B core antigen in HIV 1 infected patients and a pilot study of vaccination to determine the anamnestic response. J Med Assoc Thai 2006; 89:2028 34.
- 242. Gandhi RT, Wurcel A, McGovern B, et al. Low prevalence of ongoing hepatitis B viremia in HIV positive individuals with isolated antibody to hepatitis B core antigen. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 2003; 34:439, 41
- 243. Kemper CA, Haubrich R, Frank I, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of hepatitis A vaccine in human immunodeficiency virus infected pa tients: a double blind, randomized, placebo controlled trial. J Infect Dis 2003; 187:1327 31.
- 244. Wallace MR, Brandt CJ, Earhart KC, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of an inactivated hepatitis A vaccine among HIV infected subjects. Clin Infect Dis 2004; 39:1207–13.
- 245. Sudjaritruk T, Sirisanthana T, Sirisanthana V. Antibody responses to hepatitis A virus vaccination in Thai HIV infected children with immune recovery after antiretroviral therapy. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2011; 30:256 9.
- 246. Crum Cianflone NF, Wilkins K, Lee AW, et al. Long term durability of immune responses after hepatitis A vaccination among HIV infect ed adults. J Infect Dis 2011; 203:1815 23.
- 247. Barbi M, Biffi MR, Binda S, et al. Immunization in children with HIV seropositivity at birth: antibody response to polio vaccine and tetanus toxoid. AIDS 1992; 6:1465–9.
- 248. Kroon FP, van Dissel JT, Labadie J, van Loon AM, van Furth R. Anti body response to diphtheria, tetanus, and poliomyelitis vaccines in re lation to the number of CD4+ T lymphocytes in adults infected with human immunodeficiency virus. Clin Infect Dis 1995; 21:1197 203.
- 249. Wilkin T, Lee JY, Lensing SY, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of the quadrivalent human papillomavirus vaccine in HIV 1 infected men. J Infect Dis 2010; 202:1246 53.
- 250. Palefsky JM, Holly EA, Ralston ML, Jay N, Berry JM, Darragh TM. High incidence of anal high grade squamous intra epithelial lesions among HIV positive and HIV negative homosexual and bisexual men. AIDS 1998; 12:495 503.
- 251. Cortese MM, Parashar UD. Prevention of rotavirus gastroenteritis among infants and children: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep 2009; 58:1 25.
- 252. Madhi SA, Cunliffe NA, Steele D, et al. Effect of human rotavirus vaccine on severe diarrhea in African infants. N Engl J Med 2010; 362:289 98.
- 253. Steele AD, Madhi SA, Louw CE, et al. Safety, Reactogenicity, and im munogenicity of human rotavirus vaccine RIX4414 in human immu nodeficiency virus positive infants in South Africa. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2011; 30:125 30.
- Palumbo P, Hoyt L, Demasio K, Oleske J, Connor E. Population based study of measles and measles immunization in human immunodefi ciency virus infected children. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1992; 11:1008 14.
- 255. Aurpibul L, Puthanakit T, Siriaksorn S, Sirisanthana T, Sirisanthana V. Prevalence of protective antibody against measles in HIV infected children with immune recovery after highly active antiretroviral therapy. HIV Med 2006; 7:467–70.
- 256. Bekker V, Scherpbier H, Pajkrt D, Jurriaans S, Zaaijer H, Kuijpers TW. Persistent humoral immune defect in highly active antiretroviral therapy treated children with HIV 1 infection: loss of specific anti bodies against attenuated vaccine strains and natural viral infection. Pediatrics 2006; 118:e315 22.
- 257. Berkelhamer S, Borock E, Elsen C, Englund J, Johnson D. Effect of highly active antiretroviral therapy on the serological response to additional measles vaccinations in human immunodeficiency virus infect ed children. Clin Infect Dis 2001; 32:1090 4.
- Brena AE, Cooper ER, Cabral HJ, Pelton SI. Antibody response to measles and rubella vaccine by children with HIV infection. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 1993; 6:1125 9.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 51 of 57

- 259. Lima M, De Menezes Succi RC, Nunes Dos Santos AM, Weckx LY, De Moraes Pinto MI. Rubella immunization in human immunodeficien cy virus type 1 infected children: cause for concern in vaccination strategies. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2004; 23:604–7.
- Aurpibul L, Puthanakit T, Sirisanthana T, Sirisanthana V. Response to measles, mumps, and rubella revaccination in HIV infected children with immune recovery after highly active antiretroviral therapy. Clin Infect Dis 2007; 45:637
 42.
- 261. Scott P, Moss WJ, Gilani Z, Low N. Measles vaccination in HIV in fected children: systematic review and meta analysis of safety and im munogenicity. J Infect Dis 2011; 204 (Suppl 1):S164–78.
- No authors listed. Measles pneumonitis following measles mumps rubella vaccination of a patient with HIV infection, 1993. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 1996; 45:603

 6.03
 6.03
 6.03
- 263. Sprauer MA, Markowitz LE, Nicholson JK, et al. Response of human immunodeficiency virus infected adults to measles rubella vaccina tion. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 1993; 6:1013 6.
- Goyal S, Pai SK, Kelkar R, Advani SH. Hepatitis B vaccination in acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Leuk Res 1998; 22:193 5.
- 265. Yu JW, Borkowski A, Danzig L, Reiter S, Kavan P, Mazer BD. Immune response to conjugated meningococcal C vaccine in pediatric oncology patients. Pediatr Blood Cancer 2007; 49:918 23.
- 266. Ercan TE, Soycan LY, Apak H, et al. Antibody titers and immune re sponse to diphtheria tetanus pertussis and measles mumps rubella vaccination in children treated for acute lymphoblastic leukemia. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 2005; 27:273 7.
- 267. Polychronopoulou Androulakaki S, Panagiotou JP, Kostaridou S, Kyr atzopoulou A, Haidas S. Immune response of immunocompromised children with malignancies to a recombinant hepatitis B vaccine. Pediatr Hematol Oncol 1996; 13:425–31.
- 268. Rokicka Milewska R, Jackowska T, Sopylo B, Kacperska E, Seyfried H. Active immunization of children with leukemias and lymphomas against infection by hepatitis B virus. Acta Paediatr Jpn 1993; 35:400 3.
- 269. Zengin E, Sarper N. Humoral immunity to diphtheria, tetanus, measles, and hemophilus influenzae type b in children with acute lym phoblastic leukemia and response to re vaccination. Pediatr Blood Cancer 2009; 53:967 72.
- Patel SR, Ortin M, Cohen BJ, et al. Revaccination of children after completion of standard chemotherapy for acute leukemia. Clin Infect Dis 2007; 44:635–42.
- Alanko S, Pelliniemi TT, Salmi TT. Recovery of blood B lymphocytes and serum immunoglobulins after chemotherapy for childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Cancer 1992; 69:1481

 6.
- 272. Alanko S, Salmi TT, Pelliniemi TT. Recovery of blood T cell subsets after chemotherapy for childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Pediatr Hematol Oncol 1994; 11:281–92.
- 273. Alanko S, Salmi TT, Pelliniemi TT. Recovery of natural killer cells after chemotherapy for childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia and solid tumors. Med Pediatr Oncol 1995; 24:373 8.
- 274. Mustafa MM, Buchanan GR, Winick NJ, et al. Immune recovery in children with malignancy after cessation of chemotherapy. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 1998; 20:451–7.
- 275. Pao M, Papadopoulos EB, Chou J, et al. Response to pneumococcal (PNCRM7) and haemophilus influenzae conjugate vaccines (HIB) in pediatric and adult recipients of an allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (alloHCT). Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2008; 14:1022 30.
- Ljungman P, Andersson J, Aschan J, et al. Influenza A in immuno compromised patients. Clin Infect Dis 1993; 17:244-7.
- 277. Earle CC. Influenza vaccination in elderly patients with advanced co lorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol 2003; 21:1161 6.
- 278. Robertson JD, Nagesh K, Jowitt SN, et al. Immunogenicity of vaccina tion against influenza, Streptococcus pneumoniae and Haemophilus in fluenzae type B in patients with multiple myeloma. Br J Cancer 2000; 82:1261 5.

- 279. Nordoy T, Husebekk A, Aaberge IS, et al. Humoral immunity to viral and bacterial antigens in lymphoma patients 4 10 years after high dose therapy with ABMT. Serological responses to revaccinations according to EBMT guidelines. Bone Marrow Transplant 2001; 28:681 7.
- 280. Nordoy T, Kolstad A, Tuck MK, Aaberge IS, Husebekk A, Kaminski MS. Radioimmunotherapy with iodine 131 tositumomab in patients with low grade non Hodgkin's B cell lymphoma does not induce loss of acquired humoral immunity against common antigens. Clin Immunol 2001; 100:40 8.
- 281. Mazza JJ, Yale SH, Arrowood JR, et al. Efficacy of the influenza vaccine in patients with malignant lymphoma. Clin Med Res 2005; 3-214-20
- Centkowski P, Brydak L, Machala M, et al. Immunogenicity of influenza vaccination in patients with non Hodgkin lymphoma. J Clin Immunol 2007; 27:339 46.
- 283. Lo W, Whimbey E, Elting L, Couch R, Cabanillas F, Bodey G. Anti body response to a two dose influenza vaccine regimen in adult lym phoma patients on chemotherapy. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 1993; 12:778 82.
- 284. Yri OE, Torfoss D, Hungnes O, et al. Rituximab blocks protective se rological response to influenza A(H1N1) 2009 vaccination in lympho ma patients during or within six months after treatment. Blood 2011; 122:1946 53
- 285. Bedognetti D, Zoppoli G, Massucco C, et al. Impaired response to in fluenza vaccine associated with persistent memory B cell depletion in non Hodgkin's lymphoma patients treated with rituximab containing regimens. J Immunol 2011; 186:6044 55.
- Elting LS, Whimbey E, Lo W, Couch R, Andreeff M, Bodey GP. Epide miology of influenza A virus infection in patients with acute or chronic leukemia. Support Care Cancer 1995; 3:198 202.
- Anderson H, Petrie K, Berrisford C, Charlett A, Thatcher N, Zambon M. Seroconversion after influenza vaccination in patients with lung cancer. Br J Cancer 1999; 80:219 20.
- 288. Brydak LB, Guzy J, Starzyk J, Machala M, Gozdz SS. Humoral immune response after vaccination against influenza in patients with breast cancer. Support Care Cancer 2001; 9:65–8.
- 289. Meerveld Eggink A, de Weerdt O, van der Velden AM, et al. Response to influenza virus vaccination during chemotherapy in patients with breast cancer. Ann Oncol 2011; 22:2031 5.
- 290. Nordoy T, Aaberge IS, Husebekk A, et al. Cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy show adequate serological response to vaccinations against influenza virus and *Streptococcus pneumoniae*. Med Oncol 2002; 19:71 8.
- Vilar Compte D, Cornejo P, Valle Salinas A, et al. Influenza vaccina tion in patients with breast cancer: a case series analysis. Med Sci Monit 2006; 12:CR332 6.
- Avritscher EB, Cooksley CD, Geraci JM, et al. Cost effectiveness of in fluenza vaccination in working age cancer patients. Cancer 2007; 109:2357 64.
- Levine AM, Overturf GD, Field RF, Holdorf D, Paganini Hill A, Fein stein DI. Use and efficacy of pneumococcal vaccine in patients with Hodgkin disease. Blood 1979; 54:1171
- 294. Siber GR, Weitzman SA, Aisenberg AC, Weinstein HJ, Schiffman G. Impaired antibody response to pneumococcal vaccine after treatment for Hodgkin's disease. N Engl J Med 1978; 299:442 8.
- 295. Addiego JE Jr., Ammann AJ, Schiffman G, Baehner R, Higgins G, Hammond D. Response to pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine in patients with untreated Hodgkin's disease. Children's Cancer Study Group Report. Lancet 1980; 2:450 2.
- 296. Frederiksen B, Specht L, Henrichsen J, Pedersen FK, Pedersen Bjer gaard J. Antibody response to pneumococcal vaccine in patients with early stage Hodgkin's disease. Eur J Haematol 1989; 43:45 9.
- 297. Grimfors G, Soderqvist M, Holm G, Lefvert AK, Bjorkholm M. A lon gitudinal study of class and subclass antibody response to pneumococ cal vaccination in splenectomized individuals with special reference to patients with Hodgkin's disease. Eur J Haematol 1990; 45:101 8.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 52 of 57

- 298. Landgren O, Bjorkholm M, Konradsen HB, et al. A prospective study on antibody response to repeated vaccinations with pneumococcal capsular polysaccharide in splenectomized individuals with special reference to Hodgkin's lymphoma. J Intern Med 2004; 255:664-73.
- 299. Cherif H, Landgren O, Konradsen HB, Kalin M, Bjorkholm M. Poor antibody response to pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccination sug gests increased susceptibility to pneumococcal infection in splenecto mized patients with hematological diseases. Vaccine 2006; 24:75 81.
- Molrine DC, George S, Tarbell N, et al. Antibody responses to poly saccharide and polysaccharide conjugate vaccines after treatment of Hodgkin disease. Ann Intern Med 1995; 123:828
- 301. Sinisalo M, Vilpo J, Itala M, Vakevainen M, Taurio J, Aittoniemi J. Antibody response to 7 valent conjugated pneumococcal vaccine in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukaemia. Vaccine 2007; 26:82 7.
- 302. Chan CY, Molrine DC, George S, et al. Pneumococcal conjugate vaccine primes for antibody responses to polysaccharide pneumococ cal vaccine after treatment of Hodgkin's disease. J Infect Dis 1996; 173:256 8.
- 303. Ammann AJ, Schiffman G, Addiego JE, Wara WM, Wara DW. Immu nization of immunosuppressed patients with pneumococcal polysac charide vaccine. Rev Infect Dis 1981; 3 (Suppl):S160 7.
- 304. Hammarstrom V, Pauksen K, Bjorkstrand B, Simonsson B, Oberg G, Ljungman P. Tetanus immunity in autologous bone marrow and blood stem cell transplant recipients. Bone Marrow Transplant 1998; 22:67–71.
- 305. Chung SM, Sohn JH, Kim TY, et al. Fulminant hepatic failure with hepatitis B virus reactivation after rituximab treatment in a patient with resolved hepatitis B. Korean J Gastroenterol 2010; 55:266 9.
- 306. Yagci M, Acar K, Sucak GT, Yamac K, Haznedar R. Hepatitis B virus vaccine in lymphoproliferative disorders: a prospective randomized study evaluating the efficacy of granulocyte macrophage colony stimu lating factor as a vaccine adjuvant. Eur J Haematol 2007; 79:292 6.
- 307. Pullukcu H, Ertem E, Karaca Y, Yamazhan T, Sertoz RY, Altuglu I. Ef ficacy of accelerated hepatitis B vaccination program in patients being actively treated for hematologic malignancies. Int J Infect Dis 2008; 12:166 70.
- Ljungman P, Nahi H, Linde A. Vaccination of patients with haemato logical malignancies with one or two doses of influenza vaccine: a randomised study. Br J Haematol 2005; 130:96 8.
- 309. Takata T, Suzumiya J, Ishikawa T, Takamatsu Y, Ikematsu H, Tamura K. Attenuated antibody reaction for the primary antigen but not for the recall antigen of influenza vaccination in patients with non Hodgkin B cell lymphoma after the administration of rituximab CHOP. J Clin Exp Hematop 2009; 49:9–13.
- 310. Horwitz SM, Negrin RS, Blume KG, et al. Rituximab as adjuvant to high dose therapy and autologous hematopoietic cell transplantation for aggressive non Hodgkin lymphoma. Blood **2004**; 103:777 83.
- Lum LG, Seigneuret MC, Storb R. The transfer of antigen specific humoral immunity from marrow donors to marrow recipients. J Clin Immunol 1986; 6:389
 96.
- 312. Lum LG, Munn NA, Schanfield MS, Storb R. The detection of specific antibody formation to recall antigens after human bone marrow trans plantation. Blood **1986**; 67:582—7.
- Lum LG. The kinetics of immune reconstitution after human marrow transplantation. Blood 1987; 69:369–80.
- 314. Lum LG, Noges JE, Beatty P, et al. Transfer of specific immunity in marrow recipients given HLA mismatched, T cell depleted, or HLA identical marrow grafts. Bone Marrow Transplant 1988; 3:399 406.
- Saxon A, Mitsuyasu R, Stevens R, Champlin RE, Kimata H, Gale RP. Designed transfer of specific immune responses with bone marrow transplantation. J Clin Invest 1986; 78:959
 67.
- 316. Wahren B, Gahrton G, Linde A, et al. Transfer and persistence of viral antibody producing cells in bone marrow transplantation. J Infect Dis 1984; 150:358 65.
- 317. Witherspoon RP, Storb R, Ochs HD, et al. Recovery of antibody production in human allogeneic marrow graft recipients: influence of

- time posttransplantation, the presence or absence of chronic graft versus host disease, and antithymocyte globulin treatment. Blood 1981; 58:360 8.
- 318. Witherspoon RP, Matthews D, Storb R, et al. Recovery of in vivo cellu lar immunity after human marrow grafting. Influence of time post grafting and acute graft versus host disease. Transplantation 1984; 37:145-50.
- 319. Wimperis JZ, Brenner MK, Prentice HG, et al. Transfer of a function ing humoral immune system in transplantation of T lymphocyte de pleted bone marrow. Lancet **1986**; 1:339 43.
- 320. Molrine DC, Hibberd PL. Vaccines for transplant recipients. Infect Dis Clin North Am 2001: 15:273 305, xii.
- 321. Molrine DC, Guinan EC, Antin JH, et al. Donor immunization with *Haemophilus influenzae* type b (HIB) conjugate vaccine in allogeneic bone marrow transplantation. Blood **1996**; 87:3012 8.
- 322. Ljungman P, Wiklund Hammarsten M, Duraj V, et al. Response to tetanus toxoid immunization after allogeneic bone marrow transplan tation. J Infect Dis 1990; 162:496 500.
- 323. Ljungman P, Duraj V, Magnius L. Response to immunization against polio after allogeneic marrow transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant 1991; 7:89–93.
- 324. Engelhard D, Handsher R, Naparstek E, et al. Immune response to polio vaccination in bone marrow transplant recipients. Bone Marrow Transplant 1991; 8:295 300.
- Parkkali T, Stenvik M, Ruutu T, Hovi T, Volin L, Ruutu P. Randomized comparison of early and late vaccination with inactivated poliovirus vaccine after allogeneic BMT. Bone Marrow Transplant 1997; 20:663
- 326. Ljungman P, Lewensohn Fuchs I, Hammarstrom V, et al. Long term immunity to measles, mumps, and rubella after allogeneic bone marrow transplantation. Blood 1994; 84:657–63.
- 327. Machado CM, Goncalves FB, Pannuti CS, Dulley FL, de Souza VA. Measles in bone marrow transplant recipients during an outbreak in Sao Paulo, Brazil. Blood 2002; 99:83 7.
- 328. Parkman R; Weinberg KI. Immunological reconstitution following bone marrow transplantation. Immunol Rev 1997; 157:73 8.
- 329. Cristofani LM, Weinberg A, Peixoto V, et al. Administration of live at tenuated varicella vaccine to children with cancer before starting che motherapy. Vaccine 1991; 9:873 6.
- 330. Tsolia M, Gershon AA, Steinberg SP, Gelb L. Live attenuated varicella vaccine: evidence that the virus is attenuated and the importance of skin lesions in transmission of varicella zoster virus. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Varicella Vaccine Collaborative Study Group. J Pediatr 1990; 116:184 9.
- 331. Hardy I, Gershon AA, Steinberg SP, LaRussa P. The incidence of zoster after immunization with live attenuated varicella vaccine. A study in children with leukemia. Varicella Vaccine Collaborative Study Group. N Engl J Med 1991;325:1545 50.
- 332. Ljungman P, Ward KN, Crooks BN, et al. Respiratory virus infections after stem cell transplantation: a prospective study from the Infectious Diseases Working Party of the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant 2001; 28:479 84.
- 333. Ljungman P, de la Camara R, Perez Bercoff L, et al. Outcome of pan demic H1N1 infections in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipi ents. Haematologica 2011; 96:1231 5.
- 334. Choi SM, Boudreault AA, Xie H, Englund JA, Corey L, Boeckh M. Differences in clinical outcomes after 2009 influenza A/H1N1 and seasonal influenza among hematopoietic cell transplant recipients. Blood 2011; 117:5050 6.
- 335. Engelhard D, Zakay Rones Z, Shapira MY, et al. The humoral immune response of hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipi ents to AS03 adjuvanted A/California/7/2009 (H1N1)v like virus vaccine during the 2009 pandemic. Vaccine 2011; 29:1777 82.
- 336. Pauksen K, Linde A, Hammarstrom V, et al. Granulocyte macrophage colony stimulating factor as immunomodulating factor together with influenza vaccination in stem cell transplant patients. Clin Infect Dis 2000; 30:342–8.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 53 of 57

- 337. de Lavallade H, Garland P, Sekine T, et al. Repeated vaccination is re quired to optimize seroprotection against H1N1 in the immunocom promised host. Haematologica 2011; 96:307 14.
- Avetisyan G, Aschan J, Hassan M, Ljungman P. Evaluation of immune responses to seasonal influenza vaccination in healthy volunteers and in patients after stem cell transplantation. Transplantation 2008; 86:257

 63.
- 339. Haining WN, Evans JW, Seth NP, et al. Measuring T cell immunity to influenza vaccination in children after haemopoietic stem cell trans plantation. Br J Haematol **2004**; 127:322 5:
- 340. Gueller S, Allwinn R, Mousset S, et al. Enhanced immune response after a second dose of an AS03 adjuvanted H1N1 influenza A vaccine in patients after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2011; 17:1546 50.
- Engelhard D, Cordonnier C, Shaw PJ, et al. Early and late invasive pneumococcal infection following stem cell transplantation: a European Bone Marrow Transplantation survey. Br J Haematol 2002; 117:444
 50.
- 342. Winston DJ, Schiffman G, Wang DC, et al. Pneumococcal infections after human bone marrow transplantation. Ann Intern Med 1979; 91:835 41.
- 343. Kulkarni S, Powles R, Treleaven J, et al. Chronic graft versus host disease is associated with long term risk for pneumococcal infections in recipients of bone marrow transplants. Blood 2000; 95:3683 6.
- 344. Youssef S, Rodriguez G, Rolston KV, Champlin RE, Raad II, Safdar A. Streptococcus pneumoniae infections in 47 hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipients: clinical characteristics of infections and vaccine breakthrough infections, 1989 2005. Medicine (Baltimore) 2007; 86:69 77.
- 345. Giebink GS, Warkentin PI, Ramsay NK, Kersey JH. Titers of antibody to pneumococci in allogeneic bone marrow transplant recipients before and after vaccination with pneumococcal vaccine. J Infect Dis 1986: 154:590 6.
- 346. Avanzini MA, Carra AM, Maccario R, et al. Antibody response to pneumococcal vaccine in children receiving bone marrow transplanta tion. J Clin Immunol 1995; 15:137 44.
- Guinan EC, Molrine DC, Antin JH, et al. Polysaccharide conjugate vaccine responses in bone marrow transplant patients. Transplanta tion 1994; 57:677
- 348. Parkkali T, Kayhty H, Ruutu T, Volin L, Eskola J, Ruutu P. A compari son of early and late vaccination with *Haemophilus influenzae* type b conjugate and pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccines after allogeneic BMT. Bone Marrow Transplant 1996; 18:961–7.
- 349. Winston DJ, Ho WG, Schiffman G, Champlin RE, Feig SA, Gale RP. Pneumococcal vaccination of recipients of bone marrow transplants. Arch Intern Med 1983; 143:1735-7.
- 350. Cordonnier C, Labopin M, Chesnel V, et al. Randomized study of early versus late immunization with pneumococcal conjugate vaccine after allogeneic stem cell transplantation. Clin Infect Dis 2009; 48:1392 401.
- 351. Molrine DC, Antin JH, Guinan EC, et al. Donor immunization with pneumococcal conjugate vaccine and early protective antibody re sponses following allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation. Blood 2003; 101:831 6.
- 352. Meisel R, Kuypers L, Dirksen U, et al. Pneumococcal conjugate vaccine provides early protective antibody responses in children after related and unrelated allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplanta tion. Blood 2007; 109:2322 6.
- 353. Kumar D, Chen MH, Welsh B, et al. A randomized, double blind trial of pneumococcal vaccination in adult allogeneic stem cell transplant donors and recipients. Clin Infect Dis 2007; 45:1576–82.
- 354. Cordonnier C, Labopin M, Chesnel V, et al. Immune response to the 23 valent polysaccharide pneumococcal vaccine after the 7 valent conjugate vaccine in allogeneic stem cell transplant recipients: results from the EBMT IDWP01 trial. Vaccine 2010; 28:2730 4.
- 355. Hammarstrom V, Pauksen K, Azinge J, Oberg G, Ljungman P. Pneumococcal immunity and response to immunization with

- pneumococcal vaccine in bone marrow transplant patients: the influence of graft versus host reaction. Support Care Cancer 1993; 1:195 9.
- Barra A, Cordonnier C, Preziosi MP, et al. Immunogenicity of *Haemo philus influenzae* type b conjugate vaccine in allogeneic bone marrow recipients. J Infect Dis 1992; 166:1021 8.
- 357. Avanzini MA, Carra AM, Maccario R, et al. Immunization with Hae mophilus influenzae type b conjugate vaccine in children given bone marrow transplantation: comparison with healthy age matched con trols. J Clin Immunol 1998; 18:193 201.
- 358. Parkkali T, Olander RM, Ruutu T, et al. A randomized comparison between early and late vaccination with tetanus toxoid vaccine after al logeneic BMT. Bone Marrow Transplant 1997; 19:933 8.
- 359. Kochethu G, Clark FJ, Craddock CF. Pertussis: should we vaccinate post transplant? Bone Marrow Transplant 2006; 37:793 4.
- 360. Florax A, Ehlert K, Becker K, Vormoor J, Groll AH. Bordetella pertus sis respiratory infection following hematopoietic stem cell transplanta tion: time for universal vaccination? Bone Marrow Transplant 2006; 38:639 40.
- 361. Small TN, Zelenetz AD, Noy A, et al. Pertussis immunity and re sponse to tetanus reduced diphtheria reduced pertussis vaccine (Tdap) after autologous peripheral blood stem cell transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant 2009; 15:1538–42.
- 362. Papadopoulos E, Young J, Kernan NA, Boulad F, Castro Malaspina H, O'Reilly RJ. Use of the tetanus toxoid, reduced dose diphtheria and pertussis vaccine (Tdap) in allogeneic transplant (alloHCT) recipients. Blood 2008; 112:2214.
- 363. Nagler A, Ilan Y, Adler R, et al. Successful immunization of autolo gous bone marrow transplantation recipients against hepatitis B virus by active vaccination. Bone Marrow Transplant 1995; 15:475 8.
- 364. Jaffe D, Papadopoulos EB, Young JW, et al. Immunogenicity of recombinant hepatitis B vaccine (rHBV) in recipients of unrelated or related allogeneic hematopoietic cell (HC) transplants. Blood 2006; 108:2470 5.
- 365. Nakano T, Shimono Y, Sugiyama K, et al. Clinical features of measles in immunocompromised children. Acta Paediatr Jpn **1996**; 38:212 7.
- 366. Kaplan LJ, Daum RS, Smaron M, McCarthy CA. Severe measles in im munocompromised patients. JAMA 1992; 267:1237 41.
- 367. Machado CM, de Souza VA, Sumita LM, da Rocha IF, Dulley FL, Pannuti CS. Early measles vaccination in bone marrow transplant re cipients. Bone Marrow Transplant 2005; 35:787–91.
- 368. Spoulou V, Giannaki M, Vounatsou M, Bakoula C, Grafakos S. Long term immunity to measles, mumps and rubella after MMR vaccina tion among children with bone marrow transplants. Bone Marrow Transplant 2004; 33:1187 90.
- 369. King SM, Saunders EF, Petric M, Gold R. Response to measles, mumps and rubella vaccine in paediatric bone marrow transplant re cipients. Bone Marrow Transplant 1996; 17:633 6.
- 370. Ljungman P, Fridell E, Lonnqvist B, et al. Efficacy and safety of vaccination of marrow transplant recipients with a live attenuated measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine. J Infect Dis 1989; 159:610 5.
- Kussmaul SC, Horn BN, Dvorak CC, Abramovitz L, Cowan MJ, Wein trub PS. Safety of the live, attenuated varicella vaccine in pediatric re cipients of hematopoietic SCTs. Bone Marrow Transplant 2010; 45:1602 6.
- Van Thiel DH, Gavaler JS. Response to HBV vaccination in patients with severe liver disease. Absence of an HLA effect. Dig Dis Sci 1992; 37:1447 51.
- Danzinger Isakov I, Kumar D. Guidelines for vaccination of solid organ transplant candidates and recipients. Am J Transplant 2009; 9 (Suppl 4):S258 62.
- No authors listed. KDIGO clinical practice guideline for the care of kidney transplant recipients. Am J Transplant 2009; 9 (Suppl 3):S1 155.
- 375. Kotton CN, Hibberd PL. Travel medicine and the solid organ trans plant recipient. Am J Transplant 2009; 9 (Suppl 4):S273 81.
- 376. Kumar D, Blumberg EA, Danziger Isakov L, et al. Influenza vaccina tion in the organ transplant recipient: review and summary recom mendations. Am J Transplant 2011; 11:2020 30.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 54 of 57

- Campbell AL, Herold BC. Immunization of pediatric solid organ transplantation candidates: immunizations in transplant candidates. Pediatr Transplant 2005; 9:652

 61.
- Laube GF, Berger C, Goetschel P, Leumann E, Neuhaus TJ. Immuni zation in children with chronic renal failure. Pediatr Nephrol 2002; 17:638–42
- 379. Flynn JT, Frisch K, Kershaw DB, Sedman AB, Bunchman TE. Re sponse to early measles mumps rubella vaccination in infants with chronic renal failure and/or receiving peritoneal dialysis. Adv Perit Dial 1999; 15:269. 72.
- Benden C, Danziger Isakov LA, Astor T, et al. Variability in immuni zation guidelines in children before and after lung transplantation. Pediatr Transplant 2007; 11:882 7.
- Wu JF, Ni YH, Chen HL, Hsu HY, Lai HS, Chang MH. Humoral im munogenicity to measles, rubella, and varicella zoster vaccines in biliary atresia children. Vaccine 2009; 27:2812 5.
- 382. Prelog M, Pohl M, Ermisch B, et al. Demand for evaluation of vaccina tion antibody titers in children considered for renal transplantation. Pediatr Transplant 2007; 11:73 6.
- Duchini A, Hendry RM, Redfield DC, Pockros PJ. Influenza infection in patients before and after liver transplantation. Liver Transpl 2000; 6:531
 42.
- 384. Furth SL, Neu AM, Case B, Lederman HM, Steinhoff M, Fivush B. Pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine in children with chronic renal disease: a prospective study of antibody response and duration. J Pediatr 1996; 128:99 101.
- Linnemann CC Jr., First MR, Schiffman G. Response to pneumococcal vaccine in renal transplant and hemodialysis patients. Arch Intern Med 1981; 141:1637 40.
- Linnemann CC Jr., First MR, Schiffman G. Revaccination of renal transplant and hemodialysis recipients with pneumococcal vaccine. Arch Intern Med 1986; 146:1554

 6.
- Kruger S, Seyfarth M, Sack K, Kreft B. Defective immune response to tetanus toxoid in hemodialysis patients and its association with diph theria vaccination. Vaccine 1999; 17:1145 50.
- 388. Lin CC, Chen CL, Concejero A, et al. Active immunization to prevent de novo hepatitis B virus infection in pediatric live donor liver recipients. Am J Transplant 2007; 7:195 200.
- 389. Wachs ME, Amend WJ, Ascher NL, et al. The risk of transmission of hepatitis B from HBsAg(), HBcAb(+), HBIgM() organ donors. Transplantation 1995; 59:230 4.
- Crosnier J, Jungers P, Courouce AM, et al. Randomised placebo con trolled trial of hepatitis B surface antigen vaccine in French haemo dialysis units: II, haemodialysis patients. Lancet 1981; 1:797 800.
- Stevens CE, Alter HJ, Taylor PE, Zang EA, Harley EJ, Szmuness W. Hepatitis B vaccine in patients receiving hemodialysis. Immunogenici ty and efficacy. N Engl J Med 1984; 311:496 501.
- Villeneuve E, Vincelette J, Villeneuve JP. Ineffectiveness of hepatitis B vaccination in cirrhotic patients waiting for liver transplantation. Can J Gastroenterol 2000; 14 (Suppl B):59B 62B.
- 393. Carey W, Pimentel R, Westveer MK, Vogt D, Broughan T. Failure of hepatitis B immunization in liver transplant recipients: results of a prospective trial. Am J Gastroenterol **1990**; 85:1590 2.
- 394. Arslan M, Wiesner RH, Sievers C, Egan K, Zein NN. Double dose ac celerated hepatitis B vaccine in patients with end stage liver disease. Liver Transpl 2001: 7:314–20.
- 395. Engler SH, Sauer PW, Golling M, et al. Immunogenicity of two accelerated hepatitis B vaccination protocols in liver transplant candidates. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol **2001**; 13:363-7.
- Aziz A, Aziz S, Li DS, et al. Efficacy of repeated high dose hepatitis B vaccine (80 microg) in patients with chronic liver disease. J Viral Hepat 2006; 13:217
 21.
- Schumann A, Lindemann M, Valentin Gamazo C, et al. Adoptive immune transfer of hepatitis B virus specific immunity from immunized living liver donors to liver recipients. Transplantation 2009; 87:103-11.

- Keeffe EB, Iwarson S, McMahon BJ, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of hepatitis A vaccine in patients with chronic liver disease. Hepatol ogy 1998; 27:881 6.
- Arslan M, Wiesner RH, Poterucha JJ, Zein NN. Safety and efficacy of hepatitis A vaccination in liver transplantation recipients. Transplan tation 2001; 72:272 6.
- 400. Dumot JA, Barnes DS, Younossi Z, et al. Immunogenicity of hepatitis A vaccine in decompensated liver disease. Am J Gastroenterol 1999; 94:1601 4.
- 401. Geel AL, Landman TS, Kal JA, van Doomum GJ, Weimar W. Varicella zoster virus serostatus before and after kidney transplantation, and vaccination of adult kidney transplant candidates. Transplant Proc 2006; 38:3418 9.
- 402. Broyer M, Tete MJ, Guest G, Gagnadoux MF, Rouzioux C. Varicella and zoster in children after kidney transplantation: long term results of vaccination. Pediatrics 1997; 99:35 9.
- 403. Furth SL, Hogg RJ, Tarver J, Moulton LH, Chan C, Fivush BA. Vari cella vaccination in children with chronic renal failure. A report of the Southwest Pediatric Nephrology Study Group. Pediatr Nephrol 2003; 18:33 8.
- 404. Webb NJ, Fitzpatrick MM, Hughes DA, et al. Immunisation against varicella in end stage and pre end stage renal failure. Trans Pennine Paediatric Nephrology Study Group. Arch Dis Child 2000; 82:141 3.
- Donati M, Zuckerman M, Dhawan A, et al. Response to varicella im munization in pediatric liver transplant recipients. Transplantation 2000; 70:1401 4.
- 406. Nithichaiyo C, Chongsrisawat V, Hutagalung Y, Bock HL, Poovorawa Y. Immunogenicity and adverse effects of live attenuated varicella vaccine (Oka strain) in children with chronic liver disease. Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol 2001; 19:101 5.
- 407. Furth SL, Fivush BA. Varicella vaccination in pediatric kidney transplant candidates. Pediatr Transplant 2002; 6:97 100.
- 408. Sanchez Fructuoso AI, Prats D, Naranjo P, et al. Influenza virus im munization effectivity in kidney transplant patients subjected to two different triple drug therapy immunosuppression protocols: myco phenolate versus azathioprine. Transplantation 2000; 69:436 9.
- 409. Versluis DJ, Beyer WE, Masurel N, Wenting GJ, Weimar W. Impair ment of the immune response to influenza vaccination in renal trans plant recipients by cyclosporine, but not azathioprine. Transplantation 1986; 42:376 9.
- Soesman NM, Rimmelzwaan GF, Nieuwkoop NJ, et al. Efficacy of in fluenza vaccination in adult liver transplant recipients. J Med Virol 2000: 61:85
 93.
- 411. Dengler TJ, Strnad N, Buhring I, et al. Differential immune response to influenza and pneumococcal vaccination in immunosuppressed pa tients after heart transplantation. Transplantation 1998; 66:1340 7.
- Fraund S, Wagner D, Pethig K, Drescher J, Girgsdies OE, Haverich A. Influenza vaccination in heart transplant recipients. J Heart Lung Transplant 1999; 18:220 5.
- 413. Magnani G, Falchetti E, Pollini G, et al. Safety and efficacy of two types of influenza vaccination in heart transplant recipients: a pro spective randomised controlled study. J Heart Lung Transplant 2005; 24:588 92.
- 414. Furth SL, Neu AM, McColley SA, Case B, Steinhoff M, Fivush B. Immune response to influenza vaccination in children with renal disease. Pediatr Nephrol 1995; 9:566 8.
- 415. Madan RP, Tan M, Fernandez Sesma A, et al. A prospective, comparative study of the immune response to inactivated influenza vaccine in pediatric liver transplant recipients and their healthy siblings. Clin Infect Dis 2008; 46:712 8.
- Hayney MS, Welter DL, Francois M, Reynolds AM, Love RB. Influen za vaccine antibody responses in lung transplant recipients. Prog Transplant 2004; 14:346
 51.
- Blumberg EA, Fitzpatrick J, Stutman PC, Hayden FG, Brozena SC. Safety of influenza vaccine in heart transplant recipients. J Heart Lung Transplant 1998; 17:1075 80.

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 55 of 57

- 418. Burbach G, Bienzle U, Stark K, et al. Influenza vaccination in liver transplant recipients. Transplantation 1999; 67:753 5.
- Mazzone PJ, Mossad SB, Mawhorter SD, Mehta AC, Schilz RJ, Maurer JR. The humoral immune response to influenza vaccination in lung transplant patients. Eur Respir J 2001; 18:971

 6.
- Salles MJ, Sens YA, Boas LS, Machado CM. Influenza virus vaccina tion in kidney transplant recipients: serum antibody response to different immunosuppressive drugs. Clin Transplant 2010; 24:E17
- Mazzone PJ, Mossad SB, Mawhorter SD, Mehta AC, Mauer JR. Cell mediated immune response to influenza vaccination in lung trans plant recipients. J Heart Lung Transplant 2004; 23:1175
 81.
- 422. Hurst FP, Lee JJ, Jindal RM, Agodoa LY, Abbott KC. Outcomes associ ated with influenza vaccination in the first year after kidney transplan tation. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol **2011**; 6:1192 7.
- 423. Baluch A, Humar A, Eurich D, et al. Randomized controlled trial of high dose intradermal versus standard dose intramuscular influenza vaccine in organ transplant recipients. Am J Transplant 2013; 13:1026 33.
- 424. Kazancioglu R, Sever MS, Yuksel Onel D, et al. Immunization of renal transplant recipients with pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine. Clin Transplant 2000; 14:61 5.
- 425. Blumberg EA, Brozena SC, Stutman P, Wood D, Phan HM, Musher DM. Immunogenicity of pneumococcal vaccine in heart transplant recipients. Clin Infect Dis 2001; 32:307–10.
- McCashland TM, Preheim LC, Gentry MJ. Pneumococcal vaccine re sponse in cirrhosis and liver transplantation. J Infect Dis 2000; 181:757
 60.
- 427. Kumar D, Rotstein C, Miyata G, Arlen D, Humar A. Randomized, double blind, controlled trial of pneumococcal vaccination in renal transplant recipients. J Infect Dis 2003; 187:1639–45.
- Kumar D, Welsh B, Siegal D, Chen MH, Humar A. Immunogenicity
 of pneumococcal vaccine in renal transplant recipients three year
 follow up of a randomized trial. Am J Transplant 2007; 7:633
 8.
- 429. Kumar D, Chen MH, Wong G, et al. A randomized, double blind, placebo controlled trial to evaluate the prime boost strategy for pneu mococcal vaccination in adult liver transplant recipients. Clin Infect Dis 2008; 47:885 92.
- 430. Lin PL, Michaels MG, Green M, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of the American Academy of Pediatrics recommended sequential pneumococcal conjugate and polysaccharide vaccine schedule in pedi atric solid organ transplant recipients. Pediatrics 2005; 116:160-7.
- 431. Barton M, Wasfy S, Dipchand AI, et al. Seven valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine in pediatric solid organ transplant recipients: a pro spective study of safety and immunogenicity. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2009; 28:688–92.
- 432. Enke BU, Bokenkamp A, Offner G, Bartmann P, Brodehl J. Response to diphtheria and tetanus booster vaccination in pediatric renal trans plant recipients. Transplantation 1997; 64:237–41.
- Duca P, Del Pont JM, D'Agostino D. Successful immune response to a recombinant hepatitis B vaccine in children after liver transplantation. J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr 2001; 32:168
 70.
- 434. Sanchez Fueyo A, Rimola A, Grande L, et al. Hepatitis B immuno globulin discontinuation followed by hepatitis B virus vaccination: A new strategy in the prophylaxis of hepatitis B virus recurrence after liver transplantation. Hepatology 2000; 31:496 501.
- 435. Di Paolo D, Lenci I, Trinito MO, Tisone G, Angelico M. Extended HBV vaccination in liver transplant recipients for HBV related cirrho sis: report of two successful cases. Dig Liver Dis 2005; 37:793 8.
- 436. Arslan M, Wiesner RH, Poterucha JJ, Gross JB Jr., Zein NN. Hepatitis A antibodies in liver transplant recipients: evidence for loss of immunity posttransplantation. Liver Transpl 2000; 6:191–5.
- 437. Gunther M, Stark K, Neuhaus R, Reinke P, Schroder K, Bienzle U. Rapid decline of antibodies after hepatitis A immunization in liver and renal transplant recipients. Transplantation 2001; 71:477–9.
- 438. Kwak EJ, Julian K. Human papillomavirus infection in solid organ transplant recipients. Am J Transplant 2009; 9 (Suppl 4):S151 60.

- 439. Khan S, Erlichman J, Rand EB. Live virus immunization after orthotopic liver transplantation. Pediatr Transplant 2006; 10:78–82.
- Levitsky J, Te HS, Faust TW, Cohen SM. Varicella infection following varicella vaccination in a liver transplant recipient. Am J Transplant 2002; 2:880 2.
- Posfay Barbe KM, Pittet LF, Sottas C, et al. Varicella zoster immuni zation in pediatric liver transplant recipients: safe and immunogenic. Am J Transplant 2012; 12:2974 85.
- 442. Lawal A, Basler C, Branch A, Gutierrez J, Schwartz M, Schiano TD. Influenza vaccination in orthotopic liver transplant recipients: absence of post administration ALT elevation. Am J Transplant 2004; 4:1805 9.
- 443. Kimball P, Verbeke S, Flattery M, Rhodes C, Tolman D. Influenza vac cination does not promote cellular or humoral activation among heart transplant recipients. Transplantation 2000; 69:2449 51.
- 444. White Williams C, Brown R, Kirklin J, et al. Improving clinical practice: should we give influenza vaccinations to heart transplant patients? J Heart Lung Transplant 2006; 25:320 3.
- 445. Danziger Isakov L, Cherkassky L, Siegel H, et al. Effects of influenza immunization on humoral and cellular alloreactivity in humans. Transplantation 2010; 89:838 44.
- Lu Y, Jacobson DL, Ashworth LA, et al. Immune response to influenza vaccine in children with inflammatory bowel disease. Am J Gastroen terol 2009; 104:444 53.
- 447. Mamula P, Markowitz JE, Piccoli DA, Klimov A, Cohen L, Baldassano RN. Immune response to influenza vaccine in pediatric patients with inflammatory bowel disease. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2007; 5:851 6.
- 448. Kanakoudi Tsakalidou F, Trachana M, Pratsidou Gertsi P, Tsitsami E, Kyriazopoulou Dalaina V. Influenza vaccination in children with chronic rheumatic diseases and long term immunosuppressive therapy. Clin Exp Rheumatol 2001; 19:589 94.
- 449. Elkayam O, Bashkin A, Mandelboim M, et al. The effect of infliximab and timing of vaccination on the humoral response to influenza vacci nation in patients with rheumatoid arthritis and ankylosing spondyli tis. Semin Arthritis Rheum 2009; 63:1062—7.
- 450. Abu Shakra M, Press J, Varsano N, et al. Specific antibody response after influenza immunization in systemic lupus erythematosus. J Rheumatol 2002; 29:2555 7.
- 451. Holvast A, Huckriede A, Wilschut J, et al. Safety and efficacy of influ enza vaccination in systemic lupus erythematosus patients with quies cent disease. Ann Rheum Dis 2006; 65:913 8.
- 452. Fomin I, Caspi D, Levy V, et al. Vaccination against influenza in rheu matoid arthritis: the effect of disease modifying drugs, including TNF alpha blockers. Ann Rheum Dis 2006; 65:191 4.
- 453. van Assen S, Holvast A, Benne CA, et al. Humoral responses after in fluenza vaccination are severely reduced in patients with rheumatoid arthritis treated with rituximab. Arthritis Rheum 2010; 62:75 81.
- 454. Mori S, Ueki Y, Hirakata N, Oribe M, Hidaka T, Oishi K. Impact of to cilizumab therapy on antibody response to influenza vaccine in pa tients with rheumatoid arthritis. Ann Rheum Dis 2012; 71:2006 10.
- 455. Shinoki T, Hara R, Kaneko U, et al. Safety and response to influenza vaccine in patients with systemic onset juvenile idiopathic arthritis receiving tocilizumab. Mod Rheumatol **2012**; 22:871 6.
- 456. Saad CG, Borba EF, Aikawa NE, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of the 2009 non adjuvanted influenza A/H1N1 vaccine in a large cohort of autoimmune rheumatic diseases. Ann Rheum Dis 2011; 70:1068 73.
- 457. Elkayam O, Amir S, Mendelson E, et al. Efficacy and safety of vaccina tion against pandemic 2009 influenza A (H1N1) virus among patients with rheumatic diseases. Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken) 2011; 63:1062 7.
- 458. Gabay C, Bel M, Combescure C, et al. Impact of synthetic and biologic disease modifying antirheumatic drugs on antibody responses to the ASO3 adjuvanted pandemic influenza vaccine: a prospective, open label, parallel cohort, single center study. Arthritis Rheum 2011; 63:1486 96.
- 459. Kapetanovic MC, Saxne T, Sjoholm A, Truedsson L, Jonsson G, Geborek P. Influence of methotrexate, TNF blockers and prednisolone

Case 1:20-cv-00840-BKS-CFH Document 61-8 Filed 09/04/20 Page 56 of 57

- on antibody responses to pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Rheumatology (Oxford) **2006**; 45:106 11.
- 460. Visvanathan S, Keenan GF, Baker DG, Levinson AI, Wagner CL. Re sponse to pneumococcal vaccine in patients with early rheumatoid ar thritis receiving infliximab plus methotrexate or methotrexate alone. J Rheumatol 2007; 34:952 7.
- 461. Mease PJ, Ritchlin CT, Martin RW, et al. Pneumococcal vaccine re sponse in psoriatic arthritis patients during treatment with etanercept. J Rheumatol 2004; 31:1356–61.
- 462. Bingham CO 3rd, Looney RJ, Deodhar A, et al. Immunization responses in rheumatoid arthritis patients treated with rituximab: results from a controlled clinical trial. Arthritis Rheum 2010; 62:64-74.
- 463. Mori S, Ueki Y, Akeda Y, et al. Pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccina tion in rheumatoid arthritis patients receiving tocilizumab therapy. Ann Rheum Dis 2013.
- 464. Farmaki E, Kanakoudi Tsakalidou F, Spoulou V, et al. The effect of anti TNF treatment on the immunogenicity and safety of the 7 valent conjugate pneumococcal vaccine in children with juvenile idiopathic arthritis. Vaccine 2010; 28:5109 13.
- 465. Zonneveld Huijssoon E, Ronaghy A, Van Rossum MA, et al. Safety and efficacy of meningococcal c vaccination in juvenile idiopathic ar thritis. Arthritis Rheum 2007; 56:639 46.
- 466. Elkayam O, Yaron M, Caspi D. Safety and efficacy of vaccination against hepatitis B in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Ann Rheum Dis **2002**; 61:623 5.
- 467. Cush J. Herpes Zoster (Shingles) Vaccine Guidelines for Immunosup pressed Patients. American College of Rheumatology Hotline 2008 Available at: http://www.rheumatology.org/publications/hotline/2008 08 01 shingles.asp.
- 468. Borte S, Liebert UG, Borte M, Sack U. Efficacy of measles, mumps and rubella revaccination in children with juvenile idiopathic arthritis treated with methotrexate and etanercept. Rheumatology (Oxford) 2009; 48:144—8.
- 469. Heijstek MW, Kamphuis S, Armbrust W, et al. Effects of the live atten uated measles mumps rubella booster vaccination on disease activity in patients with juvenile idiopathic arthritis: a randomized trial. JAMA 2013; 309:2449–56.
- 470. Chalmers A, Scheifele D, Patterson C, et al. Immunization of patients with rheumatoid arthritis against influenza: a study of vaccine safety and immunogenicity. J Rheumatol 1994; 21:1203 6.
- 471. Holvast A, van Assen S, de Haan A, et al. Effect of a second, booster, influenza vaccination on antibody responses in quiescent systemic lupus erythematosus: an open, prospective, controlled study. Rheuma tology (Oxford) 2009; 48:1294 9.
- 472. Wallin L, Quintilio W, Locatelli F, Cassel A, Silva MB, Skare TL. Safety and efficiency of influenza vaccination in systemic lupus erythemato sus patients. Acta Reumatol Port 2009; 34:498 502.
- 473. Kuruma KA, Borba EF, Lopes MH, de Carvalho JF, Bonfa E. Safety and efficacy of hepatitis B vaccine in systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus 2007; 16:350 4.
- 474. Elkayam O, Paran D, Caspi D, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of pneumococcal vaccination in patients with rheumatoid arthritis or systemic lupus erythematosus. Clin Infect Dis 2002; 34:147–53.
- 475. Vernacchio L, Neufeld EJ, MacDonald K, et al. Combined schedule of 7 valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine followed by 23 valent pneu mococcal vaccine in children and young adults with sickle cell disease. J Pediatr 1998; 133:275 8.
- 476. Shatz DV, Schinsky MF, Pais LB, Romero Steiner S, Kirton OC, Carlone GM. Immune responses of splenectomized trauma patients to the 23 valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine at 1 versus 7 versus 14 days after splenectomy. J Trauma 1998; 44:760 5; discussion 65 6.
- 477. Shatz DV, Romero Steiner S, Elie CM, Holder PF, Carlone GM. Anti body responses in postsplenectomy trauma patients receiving the 23

- valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine at 14 versus 28 days post operatively. J Trauma **2002**; 53:1037 42.
- 478. Konradsen HB, Rasmussen C, Ejstrud P, Hansen JB. Antibody levels against *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Haemophilus influenzae* type b in a population of splenectomized individuals with varying vaccina tion status. Epidemiol Infect **1997**; 119:167–74.
- 479. Newcomer W, Santosham M, Bengston S, Panny S, Dover G. Immu nogenicity of *Haemophilus influenzae* type b polysaccharide and *Neis seria meningitidis* outer membrane protein complex conjugate vaccine in infants and children with sickle cell disease. Pediatr Infect Dis J 1993; 12:1026 7.
- 480. Jakacki R, Luery N, McVerry P, Lange B. *Haemophilus influenzae* diph theria protein conjugate immunization after therapy in splenectomized patients with Hodgkin disease. Ann Intern Med **1990**; 112:143 4.
- 481. No authors listed. Recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) for use of quadrivalent meningococ cal conjugate vaccine (MenACWY D) among children aged 9 through 23 months at increased risk for invasive meningococcal disease. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2011; 60:1391 2.
- 482. Administration FaD. Product approval information: package insert. Menactra (meningococcal (groups A, C, Y and W 135) polysaccharide diphtheria toxoid conjugate vaccine), 2011. Available at: http://www.fda.gov/downloads/biologicsbloodvaccines/vaccines/approvedproducts/ucm131170.pdf. Accessed 12 April 2011.
- 483. Rubin LG, Papsin B. Cochlear implants in children: surgical site infections and prevention and treatment of acute otitis media and meningitis. Pediatrics 2010; 126:381–91.
- 484. Rose M, Hey C, Kujumdshiev S, Gall V, Schubert R, Zielen S. Immu nogenicity of pneumococcal vaccination of patients with cochlear im plants. J Infect Dis **2004**; 190:551 7.

Abbreviations

AAP, American Academy of Pediatrics

BCG, bacillus Calmette Guérin

cART, combination antiretroviral therapy

CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

CGD, chronic granulomatous disease

CI, confidence interval

CMI, cell mediated immunity

CSF, cerebrospinal fluid

CVID, common variable immune deficiency

DGS, DiGeorge syndrome

DPT, diphtheria toxoid, whole cell pertussis vaccine, tetanus toxoid

DT, diphtheria toxoid in combination with tetanus toxoid

DTaP, diphtheria toxoid, tetanus toxoid, acellular pertussis vaccine

GVHD, graft vs host disease

anti HBs, antibodies to HepB surface antigen

HBIG, hepatitis B immune globulin

HBsAg, hepatitis B surface antigen

HBV, hepatitis B virus

HepA, hepatitis A vaccine

HepB, hepatitis B vaccine

Hib, Haemophlius influenzae type b vaccine

HIV, human immunodeficiency virus

HPV4, quadrivalent human papillomavirus vaccine

HSCT, hematopoietic stem cell transplant

HZ, herpes zoster

IBD, inflammatory bowel disease

BIDSA, Infectious Diseases Society of America

IFN γ/IL 12, interferon gamma/interleukin 12

IGIV, immune globulin intravenous

IIV, inactivated influenza vaccine

IPV, inactivated poliovirus vaccine

LAIV, live attenuated influenza vaccine

MBL, mannan binding lectin

MCV4, meningococcal conjugate vaccine, quadrivalent

MMR, measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine

MMRV, MMR varicella vaccine

MTX, methotrexate

NK, natural killer

OPV, oral polio vaccine

PCV, pneumococcal conjugate vaccine

pDGS, partial DiGeorge syndrome

PPSV, pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine

RA, rheumatoid arthritis

SCID, severe combined immune deficiency

SLE, systemic lupus erythematosus

SOT, solid organ transplant

SPAD, specific polysaccharide antibody deficiency

SPGC, Standards and Practice Guidelines Committee

Td, tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid vaccine

Tdap, tetanus toxoid, reduced diphtheria toxoid, and reduced acellular pertussis vaccine

TNF, tumor necrosis factor

TT, tetanus toxoid

VAPP, vaccine associated paralytic poliomyelitis

VAR, varicella vaccine

VZV, varicella zoster virus

ZOS, zoster vaccine